Vol. XXVIII. JANUARY, 1951. No. 1.

THE AUSTRALASIAN
Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS

The Official Organ for communications issued by the Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.

Announcements

MSS., queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all Queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *Yearly, in advance,* 15/-.

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—*A.C.R.* Staff.
Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.
Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. J. L. Dunn, Wellington, N.Z.
Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.
Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, Banyo, Q.
Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Launceston, Tas.
Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Cobargo, N.S.W.
Diocese of Armidale—Rev. J. Healy, Armidale, N.S.W.
Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.
Diocese of Ballarat—V. Rev. E. Glowrey, St. Arnaud, Vic.
Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Adm. Bathurst, N.S.W.
Diocese of Cairns—Rev. E. C. Clifford, O.S.A., Tully, Q.
Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.
Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.
Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, Dunedin, N.Z.
Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. Bryan Gallagher, Ph.D., Three Springs, W.A.
Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.
Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Waratah, N.S.W.
Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.
Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. P. J. Walsh, D.D., Adm., Rockhampton, Q.
Diocese of Sale—V. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, Vic.
Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, Bright, Vic.
Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.
Diocese of Townsville—Very Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.
Diocese of Wagga—V. Rev. J. Larkins, P.P., Junee, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Editor:
V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The

Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,
Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 1
The Apostolic Constitution *Munificentissimus Deus*—Communication from Apostolic Delegation [*p.* 95].

THE DEFINITION OF THE ASSUMPTION,
Rev. Cornelius Roberts, D.D., Ph.D. 16

A PLEA FOR THE ALCOHOLIC,
Rev. Richard J. Murphy, S.J. 23

BISHOP WILLSON, VI,
Rt. Rev. Mgr. John H. Cullen, V.G. 31

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY .. .. Rev. Thomas Muldoon, D.D. 44
The Theology of the Mass, II.

MORAL THEOLOGY AND CANON LAW,
Rt. Rev. Mgr. James Carroll, P.P., D.C.L. 58
Knitting on Sundays—Application of Mass—Validity of bigamist's marriage—Combined Religious Service—Ecclesiastical burial of careless Catholic.

LITURGY .. .. Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 69
Notes concerning the Church and its furnishings VI (Rev. R. F. Donohoe)—Colour of Tabernacle Veil at Requiem Mass—Server changing chalice veil after the ablutions—What conditions are necessary for the gaining of plenary indulgences for prayer to Christ the King and for the Heroic Act?

HOMILETICS .. .. Rev. Walter Baker, D.D., Ph.D. 75
Lent.

NOTES 78
The Cinema is the highest form of art—Youth and Youth Movements —Max Jacob.

CORRESPONDENCE 43

BOOK REVIEWS 88
The First Catholic Mission to the Australian Aborigines (Thorpe); *The Mystery of Faith, II* (de la Taille, *Trans.* J. Carroll); *Love is a Light Burden* (M. M. Oliver); *The Way of Divine Love* (S. Josepha) [p. 22]; *Fair as the Moon* (Oliver) [p. 30]; *Studies in Australian Social Problems* [p. 74]; *Seek Ye First* (Card. Griffin) [p. 77]; *Changing the Constitution* [p. 87].

Nihil Obstat:

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur:

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

1a die, Januarii, 1951.

Official Documents

THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION

whereby

it is defined as a dogma of faith that the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, was assumed body and soul to heavenly glory.

PIUS BISHOP

servant of the servants of God

for a perpetual remembrance of the matter.

God is the Lord of all munificence; He can do all things, and the counsel of His providence is actuated by wisdom and love; in the secret purpose of His divine plan He tempers the sorrows of peoples and of individuals by arranging intervals of joy, so that, in various modes and ways, those who love Him may find all things working together unto good.[1]

Without doubt, Our Pontificate, as well as the age in which it runs, is overwhelmed with cares and anxieties and causes of anguish. The reason is evident in the enormous calamities of the day and in the sad condition of so many who have abandoned the ways of truth and virtue. Nevertheless, a great consolation is at hand, when We see that, with the public and active manifestation of Catholic faith, piety towards the Virgin Mother of God is day by day more vigorous and fervent, and that this piety almost everywhere shows auspicious signs of better and holier living. Hence it happens that, while the Blessed Virgin most lovingly fulfils her maternal office for those redeemed by the blood of Christ, the minds and souls of her children are roused to more assiduous contemplation of her privileges.

Certainly, God, Who has set His eyes with an eternal look of utmost and most unique complacency on the Virgin Mary, has, "in the fulness of time"[2] realized the counsel of His providence in such a manner, that the privileges and prerogatives, which He granted to her with supreme generosity, shine forth as a wonderful harmony. This greatness of the divine generosity and the perfect harmony of Mary's graces the Church has always recognised, and, as time went on, has more carefully investigated, never ceasing to study them more and more. Thus it has come

---

[1] *Rom.* VIII, 28.
[2] *Gal.* IV, 4.

about that in our own age the corporal Assumption of Mary, the Virgin Mother of God, into heaven has shown itself in a greater splendour of light.

The phenomenon of this new splendour now surrounding the privilege of Mary's Assumption is easily traceable to the solemn act whereby Our Predecessor of immortal memory, Pius IX, declared the immaculate conception of the benign Mother of God a dogma of faith. The connection between these two privileges is exceedingly close. We know that Christ conquered sin and death by His own death, and through the same Christ everyone supernaturally regenerated by baptism has also conquered sin and death. The full effect of this victory over death God, however, does not will to confer by general law on the just, before the end of time shall have come. Consequently, the bodies even of the just go to dust after death, and on the last day each of them shall be joined to its glorious soul.

From that general law God willed the Blessed Virgin Mary to be exempt. Since in virtue of an altogether singular privilege she conquered sin by her immaculate conception, she was consequently not subject to the law of remaining in the corruption of the grave, and she did not have to wait till the end of time for the redemption of her body.

Hence the solemn definition that Mary the Virgin Mother of God was immune in her very origin from the hereditary stain of sin turned the minds of the faithful to a more lively hope that the dogma of the corporal Assumption of the Virgin Mary into heaven would also find speedy definition from the supreme teaching authority of the Church.

It is clear that the movement began thus. Subsequently, not only individual faithful, but those who represented Nations and ecclesiastical provinces, and even not a few of the Fathers of the Vatican Council earnestly petitioned the Apostolic See to give the definition.

Moreover, in the course of time, those petitions and expressions of desire, far from dying down, became daily more numerous and urgent. Pious campaigns of prayer were organized for this purpose; studies on the Assumption engaged the minds of many distinguished theologians, and not in private only; they were also carried on with alacrity and scientific ardour in public ecclesiastical Universities and in other schools of the sacred sciences. Marian Congresses, both national and international, were held in various parts of the world. Those studies and researches made it more and more clear that the dogma of Mary's corporal Assumption into heaven was contained in the deposit of Christian faith

entrusted to the Church. And those studies also led in most cases to new petitions supplicating the Apostolic See, that this truth be solemnly defined.

In the pious campaign thus carried on the faithful were remarkably at one with their Bishops, for the Bishops also sent petitions in goodly number to this Chair of Saint Peter. Consequently, on Our assumption to the Supreme Pontificate, the ever-growing number of petitions to this Apostolic See from every part of the universe and from all classes of persons, namely, from Our Beloved Sons, the Cardinals of the Sacred College, from Our Venerable Brethren the Archbishops and Bishops, from Dioceses and from parishes had mounted to thousands and thousands.

On Our part, We took the measure of addressing earnest prayers to God that the light of the Holy Spirit might be imparted to Us in view of deciding this important cause; and We also laid down special rules to secure a concerted movement of severely critical study of this matter. Meanwhile We ordered all the petitions regarding the Assumption of the B.V.M. into heaven to be accurately assessed, that is, all that had been sent from the time of Our Predecessor of happy memory, Pius IX, till now to this Apostolic See.[3]

Seeing that the matter was of such great moment and gravity, We considered it opportune to address a direct and authoritative request to all Our Venerable Brethren in the Episcopate, that each of them should open his mind to Us in a careful verbal communication. In view of this, We wrote to them on the first of May, 1946, the Letter beginning with the words: "Deiparae Virginis Mariae". In that Letter the following double question was asked: "Do you, Venerable Brethren, in your great wisdom and prudence, consider that the corporal Assumption of the Blessed Virgin can be set forth and defined as a dogma of faith, and do you with your clergy and people desire this?"

Now, those, whom "the Holy Spirit placed as Bishops to rule the Church of God",[4] answered both questions with almost unanimous assent. This "singular agreement of Catholic Bishops and the faithful"[5] thus considering the corporal Assumption of the Mother of God into heaven definible as a dogma of faith is a decisive argument. Showing, as it does, the concordant teaching of the ordinary Magisterium of the

[3] *Petitiones de Assumptione B. Virginis Mariae in caelum definienda ad S. sedem delatae*; 2 vol., Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1942.

[4] Acts XX, 28.

[5] Bulla *Ineffabilis Deus, Acta Pii Papae IX*, p. I, vol. 1, p. 615.

Church and the concordant faith of the Christian people, which that same Magisterium sustains and directs, this agreement manifests of itself and in a way entirely certain and free from all error that the privilege in question is a truth revealed by God and contained in that divine deposit, which Christ delivered to His Spouse, to be faithfully guarded and infallibly set forth.[6] The Magisterium of the Church does not rest on merely human industry but is carried on by the help of the Spirit of truth,[7] and thus it is free from every error in the fulfilment of its office of keeping revealed truths through every age entire and pure. Consequently it hands them on uncontaminated, adding nothing to them, subtracting nothing from them. Indeed, as the Vatican Council teaches, "the Holy Spirit was not promised to Peter and his successors that, under revelation from Him, they should set forth new doctrine, but that, under assistance from Him, they should keep with holy care and declare with faithful truth the revelation or deposit of faith delivered by the Apostles".[8] Hence, from the universal consent of the ordinary Magisterium of the Church a certain and solid argument is available to prove that the corporal Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary into heaven is a truth revealed by God, and therefore to be firmly and faithfully believed by all children of the Church. This truth, of course, inasmuch as it regards the heavenly glorificaton of the virginal body of the benign Mother of God is not knowable by the natural powers of any human faculty. The matter stated above is clear, for the same Vatican Council asserts that "all those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the word of God—Scripture or Tradition—and are set forth by the Church either by solemn judgment or by her ordinary and universal Magisterium, as things to be believed, inasmuch as they are divinely revealed".[9]

Testimonies, indications and traces of this common faith of the Church are various and are spread over the course of the ages from remote times. And this same common faith daily shows itself in more brilliant light.

Certainly the faithful, taught and led by their Pastors, have learned from the Sacred Scriptures that the Virgin Mary, throughout her earthly pilgrimage, led a life which was affected by solicitude, distress and sorrow; the faithful know, besides, that the prophecy of the holy Simeon

---

[6]Cf. Conc. Vat. *De fide Catholica*, c. 4.
[7]Jn. XIV, 26.
[8]Conc. Vat. Const. *De Ecclesia Christi*, c. 4.
[9]*De fide Catholica*, c. 3.

was fulfilled and that, as the holy old man said, a sharp sword pierced her heart at the cross of her Divine Son, our Redeemer. Similarly it was not difficult for the faithful to assent to the proposition that the great Mother of God, like her only Son before her, departed from this life. But this did not in the least prevent the faithful from openly believing and professing that Mary's sacred body was never subject to the corruption of the tomb, that the august tabernacle of the Divine Word never saw decomposition and resolution into dust. Rather, enlightened by divine grace and moved by their piety, they contemplated under a light, which daily grew in clearness, that wonderful harmony and coherence of the privileges which the God of all providence imparted to this benign partner of our Redeemer, and which attained a peak of surpassing greatness such as no creature of God beside her ever attained, except the human nature of Jesus Christ.

This same faith is manifestly attested by the great number of Churches dedicated to God in honour of the Virgin Mary assumed into heaven; it is likewise attested by those sacred images in those same churches, which are exposed for the veneration of the faithful, and set the singular privilege of the Blessed Virgin's triumphal Assumption before the eyes of all. Cities also, dioceses, and countries have been entrusted to the special guardianship and patronage of the Virgin Mother of God assumed into heaven. Likewise, religious institutes have arisen under approval of the Church which take their name from the same privilege. Moreover—and it is not to be passed over in silence—in the Rosary of Mary, of which the recitation is so warmly commended by this Apostolic See, there is one mystery proposed for devout meditation, which, as everyone knows, is on the subject of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin into heaven.

In a universal and more splendid way the common faith of Pastors and Faithful is manifested by the liturgical solemnities which have been celebrated from ancient times both in the East and in the West. From this liturgical source the holy Fathers and Doctors of the Church never omitted to draw light. Indeed, as is clear to all, the sacred Liturgy "being a profession of heavenly truths, which is subject to the supreme Magisterium of the Church, can supply arguments and testimonies of no little worth for deciding on a special point of Christian doctrine".[10]

In the liturgical books which contain the feast of the *Dormition* or Assumption of Holy Mary words are found which testify in a coherent

[10]Litt. Enc. *Mediator Dei,* A.A.S., vol. XXXIX, p. 541.

way that, when the Mother of God passed from this terrestrial exile to heaven, what happened to her sacred body was, by the counsel of God's Providence, of such sort as was in keeping with the dignity of Mother of the Word Incarnate and with the other privileges imparted to her. To give a striking example, the following is found in the *Sacramentary*, which Our Predecessor of immortal memory, Hadrian the First, sent to the Emperor Charlemagne. These are the words: "Venerable in our eyes, o Lord, is the festival of this day, in which the Holy Mother of God underwent temporal death, but could not be held down by the bonds of death, since she was the Mother of Thy Incarnate Son, our Lord".[11]

The truth indicated by this form of words, with a sobriety characteristic of the Roman Liturgy, is more strikingly and fully declared in the volumes of the ancient Liturgy of East and West. To cite an example, the *Gallican Sacramentary* calls this privilege of Mary "an inexplicable mystery, all the more to be proclaimed because amongst men it is singular". In the Byzantine Liturgy the corporal Assumption of the Virgin Mary is not only connected again and again with the dignity of the Mother of God, but with her other privileges and particularly with her virginal motherhood, brought about by a singular counsel of God's Providence. The Virgin Mother is thus addressed: "To Thee God, the King of the universe, gave what surpassed nature; for as in childbirth He kept thee a virgin, so also in the Tomb He kept thy body incorrupt, and together with thy soul glorified it by a divine translation".[12]

The fact that the Apostolic See, heiress of that office, entrusted to the Prince of the Apostles, of confirming his brethren in the faith[13] used its authority to make the celebration of the Assumption more and more solemn—this fact evidently moved the already eager minds of the faithful to a daily and ever more efficacious consideration of the importance of the mystery commemorated. Thus the feast of the Assumption from that degree of honour which amongst other Marian celebrations it had obtained from the beginning was raised to the order of the more solemn celebrations of the whole liturgical cycle. It is to be noted that Our Predecessor Sergius I, in presenting a Litany or Processional Station for the four Marian celebrations enumerates together the feast of the *Nativity, Annunciation, Purification, and Dormition.*[14] Later, St. Leo IV ordained that the feast, which already bore the title of Assumption of the Blessed Mother of God should be celebrated in a still more

[11] *Sacramentarium Gregorianum.*
[12] *Menaei totius anni.*
[13] Lk. XXII, 32.
[14] Liber Pontificalis.

solemn way with a vigil and with an octave. The same Pope used this occasion to participate personally in the solemn celebrations[15] of this festival surrounded by an enormous multitude. That the vigil of the Assumption was marked even in early times by a sacred fast is evident from what Our Predecessor, St. Nicholas I testifies in treating of the principal fasts, "which the Holy Roman Church has received from ancient times and maintains".[16]

Since the Liturgy of the Church does not make Catholic faith, but follows from it, the sacred rites of worship being the fruit of Catholic belief, it is found that the holy Fathers and great Doctors, in the homilies and sermons which they delivered to the people on this festival, did not draw on the Liturgy as the primary source of this doctrine, but spoke of it as something already known to the people and received by them. Their words were more clear and open than the liturgical texts; the sense of the doctrine and the mystery of the Assumption they set forth with greater wealth of reasons, placing in much clearer light what the liturgical books often only touched in compressed and brief forms of speech. They made it plain that in this festival not only was there a reminder that there was no corruption of the lifeless body of the Blessed Virgin, but further that it commemorated a triumph over death and the "glorification" of the Virgin after the example of Jesus Christ.

Thus, St. John Damascene, who above all others was an outstanding preacher of this truth, compares the corporal Assumption of the benign Mother of God with her other endowments and privileges, and says with remarkable force of eloquence: "It was necessary that she, who in childbirth had kept her virginity intact, should keep her body without any corruption even after death. It was necessary that she, who had carried the Creator as a child in her bosom, should herself dwell in divine tabernacles. It was necessary that the Spouse, whom the Father had betrothed should rest in the bridal palace of heaven. It was necessary that she, who had seen her Son on the cross, that she, who in giving Him birth had escaped the sword of pain and had received Him in her bosom, should contemplate Him enthroned together with His Father. It was necessary that the Mother of God should possess the things that belong to her Son, and that she should be worshipped by every creature as the Mother of God and His handmaid".[17]

---

[15] *Ibid.*
[16] *Responsa Nicolai Papae I ad consulta Bulgarorum.*
[17] St. Jn. Damasc. *Encomium in dormitionem,* hom. 2, 14; cfr. n. 3.

This voice of St. John Damascene is in faithful accord with other voices that assert this same doctrine. No less clear and accurate statements are found in those sermons which more early or contemporary Fathers delivered, mostly on the occasion of this festival. To cite some examples, St. Germanus of Constantinople considered that the incorruption of the body of the Virgin Mother of God and its elevation to heaven was not only in keeping with her divine maternity, but also with the unique holiness of her virginal body. He says in one place: "Thou, as it is written, appearest 'in beauty'; and thy virginal body is totally holy, totally chaste, totally a dwelling of God. On this head it remains alien to any subsequent resolution into dust. It is changed, indeed, inasmuch as it is human, to a sublime life of incorruptibility, but it is living and superglorious, an unharmed and perfect sharer of life".[18] Another very ancient writer asserts: "Therefore, as most glorious, the Mother of Christ our Saviour and God, the Mother of the Giver of life and immortality, is by Him endowed with life, eternally concorporeal with Him in incorruptibility, with Him Who raised her from the tomb and assumed her to Himself, as He Himself alone knows".[19]

When this liturgical feast was more widely and more devoutly celebrated, the Bishops of the Church and sacred orators in ever-growing numbers considered it their duty to explain, in open and clear-cut words, the mystery which the festival commemorates, and to proclaim that this mystery is most closely bound up with other revealed truths.

Amongst scholastic theologians there were not wanting those who examined the truth of the Assumption in the light of Sacred Letters. Applying themselves to a more thorough investigation of the truths divinely revealed, and to the task of showing the harmony that exists between theological reason and Catholic faith, those theologians observed that this privilege of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary is in wonderfully harmonious accord with the divine truths delivered to us in the Sacred Page.

Reasoning from such established harmony, they brought forth various arguments in illustration of this Marian privilege, arguments of which the first element was this: that Jesus Christ, in view of His filial love for His Mother, willed her to be assumed into heaven. The force of the argument, they declared, rested on that incomparable dignity of Mary's divine maternity and of all the gifts that follow it: her sublime

---

[18]St. Germ. Constant *In s. Dei Gen. Dormitionem.*

[19]*Encomium in Dorm. S.D.N. Deiparae Semperque Virginis Mariae* (attributed to S. Modestus of Jerusalem) n. 14.

sanctity surpassing the sanctity of all men and angels, the intimate union of Mary with her Son, and that affection of special love which the Son bore to His most worthy Mother.

Often theologians and preachers, following in the footsteps of the Holy Fathers,[20] in illustration of faith in the Assumption, use with some liberty events and words drawn from the Sacred Scriptures. To quote only a few examples of more frequent occurrence, there is first those words of the Psalmist: "Arise, o Lord, to thy rest, thou and the Ark of thy holiness".[21] This *Ark of the Covenant* made of incorruptible wood and placed in the temple of God is regarded as an image of the the pure body of the Virgin. Mary kept immune from all corruption of the tomb and raised to such great glory in heaven. Similarly, in dealing with the same matter, those orators and writers see Mary in the Queen, who enters the royal palace of heaven in triumph and sits at the right of the Divine Redeemer;[22] also in the Spouse of the Canticles, "who goes up through the desert like a column of incense from the perfumes of myrrh and of frankincense, to be crowned with a crown".[23] These descriptions are set forth by the said writers as images of that heavenly Queen and that heavenly Bride, who together with the Divine Bridegroom is borne up to the court of heaven.

Besides, scholastic doctors not only saw the Assumption of the Virgin Mother of God signified in various figures of the Old Testament, but also in that Woman clothed with the sun, whom John the Apostle contemplated in the Island of Patmos.[24] Likewise, from New Testament passages they took for special consideration the words: "Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou among women",[25] seeing in the mystery of the Assumption the complement of that fulness of grace granted to the Blessed Virgin and seeing in the Assumption a singular blessing opposed to the malediction of Eve.

Wherefore, at the beginnings of scholasticism, an exceedingly pious man, Amadeus, Bishop of Lausanne, affirms that the flesh of the Virgin Mary remained incorrupt—it is unbelievable that her body saw corruption—since it was really united again to the soul and together with the soul crowned with sublime glory in the court of heaven. The reason given is that "she was full of grace and blessed among women" (Lk. I,

---

[20]Cf. St. John Damascene, op. cit., Hom. II, n. 11; and also the Encomium attributed to St. Modestus.

[21]Ps. CXXXI, 8.

[22]Ps. XLIV, 10, 14-16.

[23]*Cant.* III, 6; cf. IV, 8; VI, 9.

[24]*Apoc.* XII, 1f.

[25]*Lk.* I, 28.

28). "True God of true God she alone deserved to conceive, as a virgin she gave Him birth, as a virgin she gave Him milk, she cherished Him in her bosom, and in all things she ministered to Him with maternal service".[26]

Amongst ecclesiastical writers who at that time used the sentences of Divine Letters and various similitudes and analogies to illustrate the doctrine of the Assumption, which was a pious belief, a special place is held by the Evangelical Doctor, St. Anthony of Padua. On the feast of the Assumption he interprets the words in which the Lord through Isaias says: "The place of my feet I will glorify", and takes occasion to assert with the utmost assurance that the Divine Redeemer Himself had His beloved Mother, from whom He had taken human flesh, clothed with the highest glory. "Hereby", he says, "it is signified that the Blessed Virgin, in the body which made her the place of the Lord's feet, was assumed". Hence the inspired Psalmist writes: "Arise, o Lord, to Thy rest, Thou and the Ark of Thy holiness". To St. Anthony it is clear that, just as Jesus Christ triumphed over death in His resurrection and ascension, so also "the Ark of His holiness *arose*, when on this day the Virgin Mother was assumed to the heavenly palace".[28]

In the days of scholasticism's highest splendour, St. Albert the Great, having gathered various arguments in proof of this truth from Scripture, from sentences of earlier writers, from the Liturgy and from theological reason, thus concludes: "From these reasons and authorities and from many others it is manifest that the Blessed Mother of God was assumed in body and soul, and raised above the choirs of angels. And this in every way we believe to be true".[29] In a sermon which he gave on the feast of the Annunciation of the B.V.M., the Universal Doctor thus explains the words of the Angel's salute: The said salute, "Hail, full of grace", leads him to compare the Holy Virgin to Eve, and he clearly and emphatically asserts that Mary was immune from the fourfold malediction which fell upon Eve.[30]

The Angelic Doctor, following in the footsteps of his great master, although he never treated the question ex professo, touches it occasionally, and constantly holds with the Catholic Church that together with Mary's soul her body also was assumed into heaven.[31]

---

[26]Amadeus of Lausanne, *De B.V. obitu, Assumptione, exaltatione.*
[28]S. Ant. of Padua, *In Assumptione Sanctae Mariae sermo.*
[29]St. Albert the Great: *Mariale* q. 132.
[30]Sermo XIV, *In Annuntiatione;* cfr. *Mariale,* q. 132.
[31]S.T., 3, q. 27, a. 1; also q. 83, a. 5, ad 8; *Expos. salutationis angelicae; in symbolum*; IV *Sent.* D. 12, q. 1, art. 3; sol. 3; D. 43, q. 1, art. 3, sol. 1 and 2.

Amongst many others, the Seraphic Doctor embraces the same view. He is quite certain that, as God kept the holy person of Mary, both in conceiving and in giving birth, immune from the violation of virginal modesty and original integrity, so He did not in the least permit her body to go the way of corruption and incineration.[32] Interpreting the words of Scripture and accommodating to the Blessed Virgin the text: "Who is she that goes up from the desert, flowing with delights, leaning on her beloved?"[33] he argues thus: "By this it is probable that she is there in body...For, since her beatitude would not be perfect, unless she was there in person, and the person is not the soul, but the composite, it is evident that it is according to the conjoint unity of body and soul that she is there; otherwise she would not have perfect fruition".[34]

In the later age of scholasticism, during the fifteenth century, St. Bernardine of Siena collects and summarizes all that the theologians of the middle age had said and disputed on this subject. This diligent continuator did not deem it sufficient to repeat the principal considerations which his predecessors had set forth; he added new considerations. He follows up the resemblance between the divine Mother and the divine Son in regard to the nobility and dignity of soul and body. This resemblance does not allow us to think for a moment that the heavenly Queen can be separated from the heavenly King. It utterly demands that "Mary *must* not be anywhere except where Christ is".[35] It is agreeable to reason and required by reason that, as the soul and body of man have attained eternal glory in heaven, so also the soul and body of woman. Besides, the Church has never sought the remains of the B. Virgin, in order to set them before the people for veneration—a proof which is equivalent "to an experience of the senses" that they are not on earth.[36]

In more recent times the views of the Holy Fathers and Doctors mentioned above were in common use. Thus St. Robert Bellarmino, embracing the consensus of Christians from former ages, explained: "And who, I ask, could believe that the Ark of holiness, the Dwelling of the Word, the Temple of the Holy Ghost went to dust? My soul has a feeling of horror at the thought the virginal flesh which begot God,

---

[32]S. Bonaventure, *De Nativitate B.M.V.* Sermo 5.
[33]*Cant.* VIII, 5.
[34]St. Bonaventure, *De Ass. B.M.V.* Sermo 1.
[35]St. Bernardine of Siena, *In Assumptione,* sermo 2.
[36]Idem, l.c.

gave Him birth, nourished and carried Him, was turned to dust or given over as food to worms".[37]

Similarly, St. Francis de Sales, having declared it beyond all doubt that Jesus Christ kept the divine command most perfectly, and in particular the commandment of honouring one's parents, puts this question: "What son, if he could, would not bring his mother back to life and after death bring her to Paradise".[38]

Furthermore, St. Alphonsus writes: "Jesus did not wish the body of Mary to corrupt after death, for it would be to His dishonour, if the virginal flesh fell away, from which He Himself had taken flesh".[39]

When the mystery celebrated in this feast had already been placed in its full light, not a few doctors gave somewhat less attention to the theological arguments proving the absolute fittingness and reasonableness of belief in the corporal Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary into heaven; they turned their minds more especially to the faith of the Church. The Church is the mystical Bride of Christ, "without spot or wrinkle",[40] and is called by the Apostle "the pillar and ground of truth".[41] Relying on the common faith of the Church, those doctors marked the contrary opinion as rash, not to say heretical. St. Peter Canisius is one such doctor—one of many. Having declared that the word "Assumption" signifies not only the "glorification" of the soul but of the body, and that the Church has for many centuries continued venerating and celebrating this Marian mystery of the Assumption, he notes: "This view, being in possession for some centuries and being fixed in the souls of the pious, and being thus a truth commended to the whole Church, it follows that those who deny that the body of Mary was assumed into heaven are not to be given a hearing, but rather put out of court as very contentious, or quite temerarious and imbued with an heretical rather than a Catholic spirit".[42]

At this same time the Doctor Eximius Franciscus Suarez had professed the mariological rule that "the mysteries of grace, which God worked in the Virgin, are not to be measured by ordinary laws, but by the divine omnipotence, supposing, of course, the becomingness of the thing in question and the absence of any contradiction or repugnance from the Scriptural side".[43] On this principle Suarez, relying on the faith of the universal Church in regard to the Assumption, could con-

---

[37]S. Robert Bellarmino, *Louvain sermons,* 40, *De Assumptione.*
[38]S. Francis de Sales Autograph sermon on the Assumption.
[39]St. Alph. M. de Liguori, *Glorie di Maria* II, 1.
[40]*Eph,* V.. 27.
[41]I *Tim.* III, 15.
[42]St. Peter Canisius, *De Maria Virgine.*
[43]Suarez F. *In tertiam partem,* Q. 25, art 2, disp. 3, sect. 5, n. 31.

clude that this mystery was to be believed with the same firmness as the Immaculate Conception. He held, even at that early date, that both truths could be defined.

All those arguments and considerations of the Holy Fathers and the theologians rest on Scripture as their ultimate foundation. The sacred page set the benign Mother of God before our eyes as inseparably united with her Son and always sharing His lot. Hence it seems almost impossible to regard her, who conceived and gave Christ to the world and nourished and embraced and caressed Him, to be separated from Him after this life, even though not in soul, in body all the same. Since our Redeemer is the Son of Mary, He, as a most perfect observer of the divine law, could not, with His Eternal Father, omit to honour His beloved Mother. And, since He could adorn her with such great honour as to keep her immune from the corruption of the tomb, it is to be believed that He really did so.

Above all, it is to be remembered that from the second century the Virgin Mary was regarded by the Holy Fathers as a new Eve, subject indeed to the new Adam, but most closely joined to Him in that warfare against the infernal enemy, which, as was presignified in the protoevangelium,[44] was to result in a complete victory over sin and death, these two (sin and death) being always associated in the writings of the Apostle of the gentiles.[45] Consequently, as the glorious resurrection of Christ was an essential part of this victory and its final trophy, so the warfare, in which the Blessed Virgin was associated with her Son, had to end in the "glorification" of her virginal body. As the Apostle says, it is only then, "when this mortal shall have put on immortality, that the word which is written shall be realized: Death is swallowed up in victory".[46]

Therefore, the August Mother of God, joined to her Son in a mysterious way from all eternity through "one and the same decree of predestination",[47] immaculate in her conception, retaining in her divine maternity her virginal integrity, the generous partner of the Divine Redeemer, Who gained a complete triumph over sin and its consequences, that August Mother at last attained, as the supreme crown of her privileges, immunity from the corruption of the tomb, so that, like her Son, she conquered death, and was raised in body and soul to the supernal glory of heaven, to shine as Queen at the right hand of her Son, the immortal King of ages.

---

[44] *Gen.* III, 15.
[45] *Rom.* V and VI; I *Cor.* XV, 21-26; 54-54.
[46] I *Cor.* XV, 54.
[47] Bull, *Ineffabilis Deus.*

Since, therefore, the universal Church, in which the Spirit of Truth lives and works, directing it infallibly to a more perfect knowledge of revealed truth—since the Church has, in the course of the ages, manifested her faith in many ways, and since all the Bishops of the whole world request with almost unanimous consent that the truth of the corporal Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary into heaven be defined as a dogma of faith, We consider that the moment appointed by the counsel of Divine Providence has come, the moment in which to define a truth which rests on Sacred Scripture, is intimately fixed in the minds of the faithful, is approved by ecclesiastical cultus from ancient times, is supremely consonant with other revealed truths, and has been splendidly explained and declared by the science and wisdom of theologians. We consider, in a word, that the moment has come in which We are solemnly to define this great privilege of the Virgin Mary.

We, who entrusted Our Pontificate in a special way to the patronage of the most holy Virgin, We who had recourse to her patronage in so many sad vicissitudes, We who consecrated with public solemnity the whole human race to her Immaculate Heart, and experienced her powerful help again and again, are now full of confidence that this solemn pronouncement and definition of the Assumption will be of no little advantage to human society, because it is for the glory of the Blessed Trinity, to Whom the Virgin Mother of God is bound by singular ties. There is reason to hope that all the faithful will hereby be roused to more intense piety towards their heavenly Mother, and that the souls of all, who glory in the name of Christian, will be moved to great desire of sharing in the unity of the Mystical Body of Christ and of increasing their love for her who bears truly maternal affection towards all the members of that August Body. There is also reason to hope that those who meditate the glorious examples of Mary will be more and more persuaded of the value of each human life that is entirely devoted to the accomplishment of the will of our Heavenly Father and to procuring the good of all mankind. Thus, while the ideology of "materialism" and the corruption that flows from it threaten to submerge the lights of virtue and destroy the lives of men in the struggles which materialism stirs up, there shall be set before the eyes of all in this wonderful way the high goal to which man's soul and body are destined. Thus, the expectation is well founded that faith in the corporal Assumption of Mary into Heaven will give new strength and life to our faith in the resurrection of the body.

The fact that this solemn event falls, by the arrangement of God's Providence, in the present Holy Year is a cause of particular joy, for it is given to Us, while a Great Jubilee is being celebrated, to adorn the brow of the Virgin with this splendid gem and leave a monument more lasting than bronze of Our ardent piety towards the Mother of God.

Wherefore, having addressed suppliant prayers to God again and again, and having invoked the light of the Spirit of Truth, for the glory of Almighty God, Who lavished His special benevolence on the Virgin Mary, for the honour of His Son, the immortal King of ages, Conqueror of sin and death, for the increase of the glory of His August Mother, and for the joy and exultation of the whole Church, We now, by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and Our own authority, pronounce, declare and define it a dogma divinely revealed that the Immaculate Mother of God, Mary ever a Virgin, on finishing the course of her earthly life, was assumed in body and soul to heavenly glory.

Hence, should anyone, which God forbid, voluntarily dare to deny or call into doubt what has been defined by Us, let him know that he has forthwith fallen away from the Catholic faith.

In order that this Our definition of the corporal Assumption of the Virgin Mary into heaven may be brought to the knowledge of the Universal Church, We have ordered these Apostolic Letters to be set forth as a perpetual memorial of the definition. We command accordingly that the same credence be given by everybody to copies of these same Letters or to printed reproductions, provided they are signed by the hand of a public notary and finished with the seal of a person constituted in ecclesiastical authority, as would be given to these presents, if shown or exhibited.

Let it therefore not be lawful for anyone to infringe this page of Our declaration, pronouncement and definition, or with rash daring oppose or contradict it. Should anyone presume to attempt this, let him know that he shall incur the indignation of Almighty God and of His Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, in the year of Great Jubilee, one thousand nineteen hundred and fifty, on the first day of November, the feast of all Saints, in the twelfth year of Our Pontificate.

I PIUS, Bishop of the Catholic Church,
thus defining subscribe.

W. LEONARD.

The Definition of the Assumption

Summary: The importance of the definition for theology. The Assumption known through dogma, not through history. The development of the doctrine retarded by three documents in particular, which in turn were occasioned by the apocryphal histories. How the Bull relates the dogma to Sacred Scripture and traces signs of the belief in distant ages. Although manifold congruousness, as such, does not prove the Assumption, the Immaculate Conception seems to *imply* it. The means taken to establish the universality of the belief in our time showed the apostolicity of the tradition and hence provided an indisputable basis for the definition.

The angelic Pastor who had already decided an old problem about the essence of Holy Order, and as late as August, 1950, had issued the monumental Encyclical, *Humani generis,* to check a new, incipient Modernism in the Church, exercised his supreme apostolic authority on November 1, to define the corporal Assumption of the Blessed Virgin into heaven.[1]

While the entire Church is gladdened, theologians have particular reason to be thankful. Besides Mary's incomparable status, dogmas concerning Redemption, the resurrection of the body, heaven, divine revelation, faith, the *consensus fidelium,* the Church and its magisterium all receive confirmation or illustration from the definition and the admirable Bull in which it is contained.

Henceforth the Apostolic Constitution, *Munificentissimus Deus,* is the classic source for the theology of the Assumption, as the *Ineffabilis Deus* has been for the Immaculate Conception. There is indeed a parallelism between the two Bulls, with a marked advantage, however, in favour of the later one by reason of its clarity, directness, precision, and restraint.

In a short space, justice cannot be done to the contents of the new Bull, and the following remarks provide no substitute for the analysis which every reader personally should make.

When novices in the study of theology, most of us no doubt were astonished to find, on reaching Mariology for the first time, that whereas the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin's soul was described as *de fide,* her corporal Assumption was not. In its small way, our surprise indicated that the doctrine which is now a dogma was part of our ancestral

[1]This article is written *absque praejudicio sanius sapientis* and with unqualified submission to the judgment of the Church.

Catholic faith, as also the present inability of many good people to see what difference the definition has made indicates. In the preliminaries of the definition, the common belief of the faithful, reflecting as it does the teaching of the ordinary magisterium, has proved an important sign of Apostolic Tradition.

With the exception of a few theologians, like Dom Renaudin, whose view admittedly was not based on evidence, no one claims that the Assumption was known explicitly from the beginning. In common with dogmas about Christ, his Church and the sacraments, and in keeping with the canon of St. Vincent of Lerins endorsed by the Vatican Council, this doctrine developed from other revealed truths in which it was contained. Under the influence of the Holy Ghost, it was unfolded in God's good time from the riches of the deposit of revelation which closed with the death of the Apostles. Development is a sign of life; and the Church is a living organism, not a museum of antiquities. Those who do not know the mystery of the Catholic Church and of the gift of faith cannot be expected to see that the Assumption is divinely revealed.

When the doctrine of the Assumption was first explicitly perceived by some, not all believers at once knew it and not all who knew it accepted it immediately. In the explication of doctrine there is a stage of hesitation, or even of opposition, prior to universal acceptance. Indecision is normal at a time when the magisterium has not yet spoken, because not all men discern the new doctrine in the old, and what is not contained in the old has no claim on Christian belief. In the Providence of God, genuine truth is tested and clarified by such questionings.

In this case there was special reason for caution, because of the dubious witness of the apocrypha. The fact of the Assumption, be it remembered, is known through the medium of dogma and not through the medium of history.[2] The circumstances in which Mary's body was taken to heaven are therefore unknown. As one of the earliest written references to the mystery said: "(Christus) apud se assumpsit, *ut ipse solus novit*" (Attributed to St. Modestus: P.G. LXXXVI, 3288-9). But irresponsible persons were not wanting who supplied the circumstances from their own imagination, after the fashion of artists indulging their fancy to fill their canvas. The legendary accounts were as extravagant as the apocryphal gospels, and were at variance with one

[2]"Historically speaking, the Assumption could be regarded as not proved. We say *not proved*: an expression which should not be confused with another, used by Tillemont, according to whom the Assumption could be theologically true and historically false".—Campana, "Maria nel Dogma Cattolico" (Edit. 2), p. 676.

another, and all that can be said for them is that they agreed about the substance of the fact.

In the late fifth century, or early in the sixth, a sober decree appeared in the name of Pope St. Gelasius—although its authenticity is disputed —including a long list of writings not received in the Church. One item is *"Liber qui appellatur Transitus, id est, Assumptio sanctae Mariae: apocryphus"* (P.L. LIX, 162). Although it repudiated only an apocryphal account and not the doctrine itself, the *Decretum Gelasianum* presumably delayed the acceptance of the Assumption, as Pesch, for example, maintained.

Another retarding influence was a spurious "Letter of St. Jerome to Paula and Eustochium". Claiming the authority of the patristic champion of Mary's perpetual virginity and of a resident in the Holy Land, it was possibly the work of Ambrose Autpert, an eighth-century Benedictine abbot. Together with much edifying instruction, it contained a gentle warning against accepting as certain the Assumption of Mary's body as well as her soul, and recommending the readers to leave the whole question to God "with whom nothing is impossible" (P.L. XXX, 123-4).

Finally, there was the influential martyrology compiled by Usuard, a Benedictine monk in Paris in the ninth century. Among the places where it was used for a time was Rome itself. For the Feast of the Assumption, called simply *Dormitio,* the elogium stated that the Church did not doubt the Blessed Virgin's death (*"ut pro conditione carnis eam migrasse non dubitet"*) but as to where her sacred body was hidden, *"plus elegit sobrietas Ecclesiae cum pietate nescire quam aliquid frivolum et apocryphum inde tenendo docere"* (P.L., CXXIV, 365). Usuard's martryology was retained in the Archdiocese of Paris until 1540.

While not directly opposing the growing belief, these restraining influences must have presented a formidable enough obstacle, especially the martyrology. Notwithstanding them, however, the belief prevailed —a fact which shows how deep-rooted it was. In the time of Gerson (15th century) it was already described as "unanimous", according to the *Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique* (Art. *Marie-Assomption,* col. 279).

The relation of the Assumption in the new Bull to the words of Holy Writ, was a subject of eager expectation for all who study the sources of revelation. Special interest was attached to the *protoevan-*

gelium (Gen. iii, 15), of which the *Ineffabilis* had made much, for the celebrated text (*"Inimicitias ponam, etc."*) has been keenly discussed in leading Roman periodicals during the last few years, especially since Fr. Ceuppens, O.P., published his view that it does not in any of its inspired meanings refer to the Blessed Virgin. The Holy Father significantly leaves the question where it was by saying simply that the *protoevangelium* promised the fullest victory over sin and death in the contest wherein Mary was closely associated with the New Adam. As early as the second century, Mary was looked on as the New Eve—a most important point—and the inference is that her unique share in Christ's victory over death, by her Assumption, was then affirmed implicitly.

With Gen., iii, 15, the Pope also connects Rom., v and vi, and I Cor., xv. St. Paul here teaches that death is a penalty of original sin, that Christ delivers us from both, and that the resurrection of the body, inaugurated by Christ's own resurrection, is but the completion of the individual's redemption. Seeing that Mary was free from original sin, she was not bound by the ordinary demands of the tomb. (The Bull, without defining it, clearly enough affirms—against a few nineteenth-century thèologians—that she died, like her divine Son.) As her initial redemption was anticipated through her Immaculate Conception, so her complete redemption was accomplished by an anticipated resurrection.

Psalm cxxxi, 8 (*"Surge Domine in requiem tuam, tu et Arca sanctificationis tuae"*) and Psalm xliv, 10, 14-16 (*"Astitit regina a dextris tuis in vestitu deaurato, etc."*), which were claimed by Lepicier, for example, to contain an implicit statement of the Assumption, are said by the Pope to be only adapted, *quadam libertate.* Likewise, three suggestive texts from the Canticle.

Scholastic doctors, imitating some Fathers, are credited for seeing the Blessed Virgin symbolised in the *Mulier amicta sole* (Apoc., xii, 1) as well as in Old Testament figures, and also for viewing the Assumption as the complement of that fulness of grace which they saw in *"Ave, gratia plena"* (Luke, i, 28). The Bull does not expressly say that the inspired sense of either text envisaged the Assumption.

In the end, all the arguments advanced by fathers and theologians are based on Sacred Scripture—as the Pope points out—not so much on any one text as on all that the gospels record of the special relationship between Mother and Son in the mysteries of the Incarnation and Redemption.

Just as Tradition alone can tell us what writings are divinely inspired (St. Augustine said he would not believe the Gospel but for the Church's authority) so it alone can interpret with certainty the Word of God, whether written or unwritten, and declare its content. Our Holy Father the Pope did not decide (what remains unknown) when exactly the Church began to realize that the content of revelation included the Assumption, but he merely stated that evidence of explicit belief is found in distant ages—*"a remotis temporibus"*. The earliest testimony quoted is a splendid passage from St. John Damascene (8th century), although the Bull says there were earlier witnesses—possibly referring to such as St. Gregory of Tours and St. Andrew of Crete. St. Germanus of Constantinople (8th century) and a work attributed to St. Modestus of Jerusalem are also cited. The Sacramentary called Gregorian, the Gallican Sacramentary and the Byzantine Liturgy add their solmen testimony to the evidence from West and East. From the seventh century onwards, Popes actively approved of the Feast, beginning with Sergius I.

Reasons showing the appropriateness of the Assumption were offered in plenty by later theologians, well before St. Thomas said that it was "reasonably believed." The chief of these were her Divine Motherhood (*"Caro enim Jesu est Mariae"* is a formula from an excellent treatise by the pseudo-Augustinus—P.L. XL, 1141); her wonderful virginity in conceiving and bearing; her unique ministration to and co-operation with Christ; her surpassing sanctity and her Immaculate Conception.

The Bull conveys the impresson that the Immaculate Conception is more than a *ratio convenientiae* and that the doctrine of the Assumption is implicitly contained in the other dogma. "She who, through a singular privilege, had conquered sin by her Immaculate Conception, and hence was not liable to the law of remaining in the corruption of the tomb, had not to wait until the end of the ages for the redemption of her body." Once the Immaculate Conception was defined, the other prerogative was seen in clearer light.

If the belief was not explicit in the "early" Church—a purely relative designation, depending on how long the world will last—that fact need cause no concern to Catholics, for Christ promised that the Holy Spirit would be with his Church not for, say, five centuries but for ever, and we do little justice to the Church to-day if we suppose that it is not as genuinely supernatural and true as it was in the fifth century.

To establish the apostolicity of a belief it is not necessary to trace it back in an unbroken chain to the Apostolic age. Doctrine that is universally accepted as divinely revealed, in any age, springs from the Apostle's teaching, as we know from our principles about Tradition. Consequently, to establish with certainty whether the Assumption was definable, it was sufficient to ascertain the faith of the Church in our own age. Nor had the Pope to settle the question raised by theologians, whether the doctrine was in the deposit *formaliter et implicite* or only *virtualiter,* or the additional point, whether a truth only virtually in revelation could be defined.

After Cardinal Pacelli was raised to the Chair of Peter, he gave orders that the thousands of petitions for the definition sent to the Holy See in increasing numbers since some two hundred bishops at the Vatican Council had asked for it should be collected and analysed. The result was a highly systematised compilation in two large volumes, edited by Fr. Wilhelm Hentrich, S.J., printed by the Vatican Press in 1942, and published in 1945, under the title, *"Petitiones de Assumptione Beatae Virginis Mariae in caelum definienda, etc., etc."* From the mass of evidence, it appeared that the doctrine was in the ordinary magisterium of the Church; but, to put the matter beyond all doubt, the Holy Father consulted the entire Teaching Church in a reserved Encyclical to the bishops of the world, on May 1, 1946, asking their Excellencies to inform him upon the attachment of their clergy and people to the Assumption and putting these specific questions: "(1) 'Do you, Venerable Brothers, in your outstanding wisdom and prudence, judge that the corporal assumption of the Most Blessed Virgin can be set forth and defined as a dogma of faith', and (2) 'do you, together with your clergy and people, so desire?'" To both queries, the reply was an "almost unanimous" affirmative.

This reply, from those who inherit Christ's commission to teach all nations, showed that the Assumption was already *de fide divina et catholica* because it was affirmed with moral unanimity by the ordinary magisterium of the Church. On this ground the Supreme Pontiff proceeded to the definition. The irreformable judgment in which the *fides divina et catholica* became *definita* is expressed in the majestic sentence ending with the words...*"pronuntiamus, declaramus et definimus divinitus revelatum dogma esse: Immaculatam Deiparam semper Virginem Mariam, expleto terrestris vitae cursu, fuisse corpore et anima ad caelestem gloriam assumptam".*

A notable feature of the Bull is that it is subscribed not only by the Pope but also by the cardinals present at the definition, and it is a source of special pleasure to see Australia represented there by the signature of his Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Sydney.

The presence, at the definition, of thirty-six cardinals and six hundred bishops, together with a multitude estimated at approaching a million of the faithful and the joyful acclamation with which the Papal act was at once received—far exceeding the demonstration when the Divine Motherhood was defined at Ephesus—once again has manifested the deep devotion of the Church to the Blessed Mother of our Saviour and to the person of his chief Vicar, the Pope.

As never before, there is now verified the prophetic utterance of the humble Maiden whom God exalted: "Behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed, because he that is mighty hath done great things to me; and holy is his name".

CORNELIUS ROBERTS.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

THE WAY OF DIVINE LOVE. Sands and Co., London. pp. xxxvii-532. 15/-.

In this revealing book of a soul's truly great love for God we have a demonstration of how one ought to love God in an attempt to make reparation for the sins of the world and infidelity of His chosen souls.

This book has a unique interest which is brought about by the very intimate notes made by Sister Josepha herself at the command of the Mother Assistant of the Convent. (Providence must surely guide these Reverend Mothers when they so command their daughters. We would have neither this book or any of St. Therese's without such commands.) The notes are intimate in the sense that they are the innermost expressions of love poured forth by a true spouse of the Bridegroom Who seeks tremendous gifts of love to be used for expiation and also consolation of His Sacred Heart.

The method used in narrating all these events has to be got used to. When I first started to read the book, the quotations from Josepha's notes with just a link here and there by the compiler tended to exasperate me. Later the realization came that a mere narration by a third person would have been totally inadequate to bring out the force and burning degree of both darkness and resplendent lustre which shadowed and enlightened this chosen soul.

The Introduction by H. Monier Vinard, S.J., has a short biography and description of Josepha's mission and the message she received. An appendix gives supplementary notes and teachings on Purgatory. The analytical index supplied is both complete and useful for reference work.

F.D.

A Plea for the Alcoholic

Summary: Problem of inveterate drunkard—Alcoholic to be distinguished from drunkard—Alcoholic is a diseased man—History of Alcoholics Anonymous—its method: the 12 Steps and the Group meeting—What should Catholics think of its teaching about religion?—Hope for the inveterate drunkard—What can be done to help him.

We are all familiar with the breed. The inveterate drunkard whose persistent visits plague our lives. We have tried everything. Good advice and scoldings. We have given pledges and clothes, food and money. All to no purpose. In disgust we finally drive him hence, telling him never to darken our doors again. That, too, is of no avail. It will not be long before he stands brazenly before us again with the same bleary eyes and sickly smile. "Just this once, Father, and never again."

Now this experience is not confined to one presbytery or group of presbyteries. It is widespread. That means that in our midst exists a pretty large group of Catholic inebriates. It also means we have failed to do any good to these victims of alcohol. In spite of zealous efforts sometimes continued over a long period, our cures have been nil. As priests we are definitely defeated. Taking an over all view we have been successful in all other avenues of work. We have had failures—perhaps plenty of them—but successes are on record to offset these failures. With the alcoholic this is not so. As far as they are concerned it is just blank failure. What is the reason for this?

We venture the following remarks as a reply to this question. We suggest, in the first place, that our failure is due to ignorance of what an alcoholic really is. This ignorance is easily accounted for. Until comparatively recent years, all heavy drinkers were lumped together. A drunk was a drunk and that was all there was to it. But that is now known to be inaccurate and misleading. It is now recognised that only 5 per cent. of drunkards are alcoholics. Every drunkard is not an alcoholic, though every alcoholic is a drunkard.

In this matter our text books may not be very helpful. They really are not concerned with seeking a cure. They deal with a moral problem. In the case of the alcoholic, the moral problem does not arise until the disease has been arrested. Let us emphasize here that alcoholism is a real disease. We shall have to mention this later on.

What then is an alcoholic? An alcoholic is a compulsive drinker. That means that once he touches alcohol he cannot stop drinking till the

bout exhausts itself. When, with the help of medical treatment, he recovers, he remains sober for a while; but the craving soon returns and he starts on another bout. These bouts increase in number and severity, till in the end, unless something is done for him, the alcoholic is faced with insanity or an early death. During his bouts he is irresponsible. He does not know what he is doing, and when he recovers is loth to admit the charges made against him, in spite of the black eyes, split lips and broken crockery that bear witness against him. His personality undergoes a change. He loses all sense of morality and the truth is not in him. His one object in life is to get drink. The world is his enemy.

This compulsion is not inherited; but it may be innate in this sense, that a man becomes an alcoholic from his first drink. Usually, alcoholism is a condition of mind and body acquired through years of drinking and is definitely established between the ages of 30 and 40. What has happened is that at some particular stage in his drinking, a chemical change has taken place in the victim's body. The nature of this change is doubtful, but at the moment it does not matter. However, this we do know with certainty, that once that change has taken place the alcoholic can no longer touch alcohol. Alcoholism, consisting of an obsession of mind and increasing sensitivity of body, has set in. This condition is incurable. Once an alcoholic, always an alcoholic.

Now, it is very important to realise that a man in this condition is a sick man. He has a definite disease, and an incurable one. There is no use in telling him "to use his will power", "to pull himself together", "to think of his family", etc. You might as well tell a man with a heart attack to pull himself together. The man has a disease about which we can do nothing; but there is a way of arresting this disease, and we may succeed in disposing a man to adopting this way, if we treat him as a sick man and don't preach at him.

At this stage, it makes no difference what his antecedents have been. His downfall may be due to bad companions, to strain of business, family worries, to neglect of religion, or he may be just one more war case. Whatever the cause, the fact is that he now has a disease and an incurable one. But as diabetes is an incurable disease and modern medical science has provided a means of arresting it, so alcoholism is incurable, but can be arrested.

And this brings us to another reason for our failure with the alcoholics we have met. It is that we do not know that a means of arresting this disease exists; or we do not appreciate the efficacy of its

methods. This means of arresting the alcoholic's disease is known as Alcoholics Anonymous.

Alcoholics Anonymous (AA for short) has received some publicity these last few years. There are few priests who will not have heard of it. But how many know anything about its methods or how to bring it to bear upon the cases they come across? We venture to say, not very many. Hence a word upon this very extraordinary Fellowship is necessary as part of this plea for greater pastoral help to the aloholic.

AA is described by its founder, Bill Wilson, in these words:—

> "Alcoholics Anonymous is a fellowship of men and women who share their experience, strength and hope with each other that they may solve their common problem and help others to recover from alcoholism.
>
> "The only requirement for membership is an honest desire to stop drinking. AA has no fees. It is not allied with any sect or denomination, politics, organisation or institution; does not wish to engage in any controversy, neither endorses nor opposes any causes. Our primary purpose is to stay sober and help other alcoholics to achieve sobriety".

AA was founded in 1935. The story is too long to tell here. Suffice it to say that Bill Wilson, who was an alcoholic of long standing and an agnostic, became sober through the religious influences brought to bear on him by a member of the Oxford Group, and by working to cure other alcoholics. (Later they abandoned the Oxford Group and its methods and devised those known as AA.) Through his work among alcoholics he soon gathered a band of men willing to try out his ideas. These numbered about 100, and during three years they worked out by trial and error the healing methods of AA. In 1940, they gave to the world the results of their experience in the AA textbook, "Alcoholics Anonymous",[1] and took this also as the title of the Fellowship which hitherto had been nameless.

This book is the backbone of AA. It opens with a typical story of drinking and recovery. Next comes a chapter of hope, "There is a solution". Two chapters describe alcoholism. A chapter deals with the softening up of the agnostc. This leads to the Twelve Steps of Recovery —the heart of AA therapy. Chapters are devoted to wives, family relations, and employers.

---

[1]To be obtained from Angus and Robertsons, Castlereagh St., or The Radio Library, 76 Pitt St.

When the book got into circulation, things began to move at an amazing rate. The growth of AA from then on was phenomenal. It was definitely on the map of U.S.A. and covered the whole of it. To-day, this fifteen-years-old Fellowship has 100,000 members in the U.S.A. alone. Of these, we have it on the word of the founder, 50% get sober at once, 25% do so after some relapses, and the remainder usually show improvement. Some alcoholics leave AA after a brief contact. Some of these are psycopathic or too damaged by drink. Others leave because they are not yet ready to make the admission that they are beaten. They still rationalize and try to bluff themselves that they will some day cure themselves. Eventually, most of these return and are cured.

In the meantime, AA crossed the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. It is now established in thirty countries of the world and achieving results as great as in the parent land.

Australia was the first country outside America into which AA was introduced. Through the efforts of Dr. S. J. Minogue, it came to this country some five years ago. It has Groups now in all the capital cities and in several country centres. The results obtained so far not only justify the efforts made to establish it, but, given the difference of population, are comparable with those attained in America. Indeed, experience justifies us in saying that any alcoholic, man or woman, who takes up the AA way of life and adheres to it sincerely and perseveringly, will attain permanent sobriety.

Now a word about the method of cure. The AA method is twofold. It comprises the Programme of Recovery, known as The 12 Steps, and the weekly Group meeting. Both of these are necessary. Rarely does anyone recover by himself. The Group is the school where the Steps are learned: while the Group without The Steps is meaningless and of no avail in the hour of trial. It is The Steps that carry the real power of cure. They derive this power from the well ordered and vigorous spiritual discipline they apply to the soul of the alcoholic.

It would take more than the available space to transcribe the 12 Steps. They can be found in the book, "Alcoholics Anonymous". To obtain adequate knowledge of AA, one must read this book.

However, a study of the Steps reveals that the doctrine of Steps one to eleven is good, old-fashioned Catholic doctrine and practice, though clothed in a language that is unfamiliar to Catholics.

In the first Step, he who wishes to be cured must admit without reservation, that alcohol has him beaten. He is powerless and his life unmanageable through drink.

This is the most important Step—and, to many, the most difficult. Many will not make it till they have bitten the dust, till all is lost and they face death or insanity. Others are more fortunate and gain the necessary humility of mind needed for complete submission more quickly. These number about 50% of those who join AA.

The next Step takes the patient to God, from whom the power to overcome the drink is to come. To the care of God he has to turn over his life and will. To do this honestly he must examine his whole life, record all his wrongs, defects, and sins; he must acknowledge these to God, to himself, and *to another human being.* He has to repair all evil done in his drinking days and make amends to those he has wronged.

In other words, our familiar examination of conscience, contrition and confession (non-sacramental for non-Catholics) and purpose of amendment. Then back again to God for grace to straighten out our lives and to cure our disorders.

To secure perseverance, the daily examination of conscience is introduced, while close contact with God is to be gained by "prayer and meditation".

This is the Programme of the Steps one to eleven. It is not a new one. It is found in every effort at personal reformation.

Not so in regard to Step 12. Here AA has something new to offer. AA discovered early in its history these two things: that only ex-alcoholics can penetrate the mind of the alcoholic, and that, in exercising this power, the ex-alcoholic derives a new strength against the craving for alcohol. For this reason, Step 12 is much stressed in AA. Hence AA sends out all members, even those whose cure is incomplete, to work on other alcoholics.

This Programme is each one's personal responsibility. In addition, attendance at the Group meeting is necessary. The Group, with its weekly meeting, is the lifeline of all members, new and old. It is a source of hope and courage to the new member, and of perseverance and confidence to the older ones.

Such is a brief and very inadequate sketch of AA. It is offered in the hope that some may pursue the matter further and, by doing so, equip themselves to render pastoral help to the victims of alcohol. It is for the sake of these alcoholics that we make this plea.

It will be asked what does this imply? It can be said, it involves a careful reading of the book, "Alcoholics Anonymous". It will be necessary to make contact with AA through the Group in the Parish

or district. Constant, or even frequent attendance, at Group meetings is not at all necessary. An occasional visit, which is always welcomed, will be found instructive and useful for making contacts. The priest will also have to know Catholic or non-Catholic members of AA to whom he may refer cases he will come across. For it must be insisted upon that no priest is able to handle an alcoholic. He cannot build a bridge of mutual confidence and understanding between himself and the alcoholic. He does not know the victim's mind nor can he talk a language the victim will understand. The most the priest can do is to "soften up" the patient. That is, he may succeed in inspiring him with the desire to quit drinking. The rest is the work of the ex-alcoholic who takes over from the priest and eventually introduces the patient to his Group. At this stage we have to deal, not with sin, but with sickness. Later, when the patient has settled down in AA and has been sober for some time, the priest again takes up the work and helps the patient through his self-examination and his confession, and will naturally give all the other helps that a priest can give. This frequently includes full instruction in the faith, which was never known or is forgotten.

There is a problem which AA is facing, which a wider co-operation of priests might help to solve. In spite of the very real success of AA in Australia, it has to be admitted that it has reached, with few exceptions, only the white collars. At a Group meeting there is no social distinction. Such a thing would be unimaginable among a group of AA men.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that people of the same social standing will cling together more easily. And it is to be feared that those of a social rank below the white collars do not readily turn to AA today. This is noticeable in the composition of various Groups. Men of good social standing, and who are not Catholics, invariably prevail in numbers and influence. There are indeed some amongst them who are Catholics and are outstanding. These are, however, the minority. One cannot help feeling that there must be many, many Catholics of the lower social strata who sadly need the help AA can give. In America 40% of AA are Catholics. The proportion here is very much less. The problem is to bring AA to them, or them to it.

This must not be taken as a suggestion that Catholic Groups should be formed. To do so would act adversely upon the spirit of the Fellowship and, in the long run, do more harm than good. We must have mixed Groups, but Groups that will cater for all classes of the social body.

This is a problem to which few are alive as yet. It exists, however, and it awaits solution. It also widens the field of influence which the Catholic priest could exercise in extending the AA movement.

A final consideration in this plea for the alcoholic is the great need these victims of drink have for the priest and the help he alone can give.

Those who have been processed in AA will not only regain sobriety, but will also return to the practice of religion. Experience shows that those who fail in this rarely remain sober.

It is true that AA is not connected with any church or sect. In fact, its only dogma is that there is "A Power greater than ourselves" and that that Power is "God as you understand Him". These words are unfamiliar to Catholic ears and are sometimes viewed with suspicion. It is thought that AA teaches that one religion is as good as another and rests satisfied with a mild Deism. However, that is not true. The words quoted from the 12 Steps are designedly used by AA and for this reason. Alcohol is known to be no respecter of persons or beliefs. It claims its victims among those who believe and those who don't. Hence, wishing to cast its net as widely as possible, AA places before its members as a minimum the belief in a "Power greater than ourselves" and "God as you understand Him". Or at least they must keep an open mind regarding God and the whole spiritual element in the AA Programme. If the member does not grant this minimum, but remains hostile, he will not remain sober. Experience everywhere bears testimony to this.

On the other hand, those members who do believe are urged to practise religion and to follow God as they have been taught to do. Here again experience teaches that failure to follow God honestly according to the light within us will bring disaster—a return to the drink. The reason is that through the 12 Steps the member has learned the need of religion. If he be a Catholic he soon realises that he must take up again the practice of his Faith. If he refuses, well, he is, in fact, not "on the Programme". He will not remain sober. AA can do nothing for him while he remains in this state of mind.

Now it is at the stage when a man (or woman) is shyly and fearfully making his way back to the church, he has neglected for years, that he greatly needs the help of a priest. But it must be a priest who realises how great are the man's difficulties, how real his fears, and how ignorant he is. It must be a priest who will lead rather than drive; who will show kindness and sympathy, and be tolerant of failures in one who is recover-

ing from a long sickness, and tolerant, also, because he knows that road from the far-off country and the husks of swine to the Father's House is long, and many pitfalls for a weak man lie thereon.

If a poor, struggling alcoholic meets such a priest he will make the journey safely and eventually reach sobriety. The priest will have gained another soul for Christ. He may kill the fatted calf and make merry, for a soul that was lost has indeed been found, and there is rejoicing among the angels in heaven.

Note.—Those wishing further information may apply to these two centres:

For Sydney generally: Box 20, P.O. Burwood.
For North Sydney: Ring XY 1754, or write Box 24, P.O. Milson's Point.

RICHARD J. MURPHY, S.J.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

FAIR AS THE MOON, by Father M. Oliver O. Cist. R. Messrs. H. Gill and Son Ltd., Dublin. ppix-235. 12/6.

"For in these humble pages we are looking for our human mother rather than our celestial queen". p. 134.

The above is exactly what Father Oliver has done. I need say no more to show that this book is different from others which I have read on Our Lady. However, I cannot resist from saying what I am about to say.

I have often wished to read a book written by a realist. Here I have read it. The phrase, "She is the grandest reality under God the Divine source of all reality" (p. 72) keeps coming into my mind, and I seem to revel in the thought. Father Oliver is as real in his realism of the human side of our celestial Mother as he is iconoclastic of the statues of her which leave only cold impressions of what Our Lady really is. Statues of St. Joseph also come under the hammer of Father Oliver, who is at times almost ferocious (of which ferocity, pages 115 and 116 give forceful examples); again I revel in it.

In dealing with our Blessed Mother before the Incarnation Father Oliver's matter is based on sound reasoning, though some of his deductions seem forced. However, he leaves them open to negation, which saves them from being overbearing.

There is, then, the use of the archaic 'limned' several times along with modern expressions like 'physical get-up'.

The book is good as well as different. Father Oliver reminds one of St. Ignatius describing how he would "crunch the Body of Christ with his teeth". which brings up mention of the excellent and beautiful description of a priest's life and function on page 164.

We can only come to one conclusion on finishing this book, She is truly fair as the moon, and as real.

F.D.

Bishop Willson, VI.

THE CHARITY OF CHRIST.

Summary: Bishop Willson's sympathy with the mentally afflicted—His work for lunatics in Tasmania—State of affairs in asylum at New Norfolk—Becomes active member of Asylum Board—Desires new asylum to be erected near Hobart—Gives evidence before State Committee—His wide knowledge of the subject—Takes active interest in new asylums in Melbourne and Sydney—Gives eloquent description of the wealth of Sydney—Contrasts poor state of asylums with general comfort—Arouses opponents, but gains supporters—The prison system again—Severe criticism of the Roman prison.

Men and women prepared to accept cheerfully the allotted duty of ministering to minds diseased have nobly served the Church in every age, willing to spend their days with the outcast and the friendless. Few have been found like Vincent de Paul and Peter Claver, who deliberately sought such a life, prayed that it might be given them, preferring it to other forms of Christ-like exertion. Amongst those few Dr. Willson can be justly numbered. Who could place on record a full account of his self-sacrifice in the arena of his own choosing? Only in the Book of Life will that chapter be written. Just as the sick of mind and the felon are kept out of sight by lofty walls and locked doors, so, too, the heroes of Christian charity are called to labour in a vineyard that is well fenced in against the eyes of the multitude. The unthinking world never becomes truly aware of its indebtedness to the Lord's faithful disciples who have abandoned it.

All over England the pastor of Nottingham had won a reputation as a persevering advocate of human systems of dealing with the Insane. In the scientific study of mental disorders he was a recognised leader; and in some respects a pioneer. Many victims could be cured; many must improve under medical and specialist supervision; none should be abandoned as beyond human aid. Study and experience had convinced this apostle of charity that reforms were long overdue. All England hailed the pastor of Nottingham as a crusader vowed to a noble enterprise. Neither exile nor the burdens of the episcopal office could induce Bishop Willson to relax in his campaign for the general recognition of human rights. To him Van Diemen's Land was just a change of scene offering even greater opportunities. Here, as in England, there existed two classes whom he loved and served with undying affection—the insane and the imprisoned. To do justice to this one feature of Dr. Willson's mission of mercy it would be necessary to set aside a special volume.

Under the regime of Sir George Arthur, some fourteen years before the Bishop's arrival, a Hospital for the Insane had been established at New Norfolk. Not a great deal of thought had entered into planning, the ruling motive being to have a building in which lunatics might be segregated. Like other public institutions of the period it was devised to meet the requirements of a Penal Colony. Most of the inmates had reached there by way of the prison-ship or the isolation cell. Once out of sight—twenty-two miles from the capital—these unhappy men and women ceased to interest the remote world of the free community.

A change came in 1855: the Asylum was then transferred to the newly-elected Colonial Government. For unfortunate patients under its control at the date of transfer the Imperial authority henceforth accepted only financial responsibility. Local administration by a competent Board of Commissioners produced immediate beneficial results. Parliament went a step further on the highway of progress in 1858 when an Act for the Regulation of the Care and Treatment of the Insane was placed on the Statute Book. Of the Board functioning under this Act the Bishop of Hobart was an active and alert member. In all directions his enthusiasm was inspiring: he pleaded, wrote, and agitated without respite for a modern Hospital in cheerful surroundings close to the city of Hobart.

To facilitate visits of doctors, students, and friends, as well as for business reasons and easier supervision, Dr. Willson considered that the Hospital should not be further away than two miles from the city. He wanted also better buildings with not less than fifty acres of land, recreation rooms, playgrounds, workshops, and chapel. "I would beg leave to suggest", he wrote to the Government, "that an eligible site should be selected and reserved for a future Hospital for the Insane; which, I trust, before many years will be erected and occupied, instead of that far-removed, ill-constructed, and very imperfect building now set apart for that very important purpose at New Norfolk".

Never would the Bishop consent to be a mere figure-head attending routine meetings, and voting on amendments to the regulations. He loved the sick and the suffering too much for that. Often he interviewed them, speaking words of hope and sympathy, noting how they lived and how they responded to sincerity and friendliness. Again and again he expressed his mind[1] to those in office:

"As the Government has done me the honour to place my name on the list of Commissioners...I spent a considerable time at the Institution in order that I

[1] *Hospital Reports*, Tasmania.

might be better acquainted with its construction, and the general system pursued in the treatment of the patients than I had been. ... I should now consider myself wanting in duty as a Commissioner, to the present unfortunate inmates, to those who may have to follow them, and to the Colony at large, did I not, with much anxiety, most respectfully represent to you some of the evils which I believe now exist, in the hope that a remedy may be obtained with all reasonable despatch".

In vigorous terms Dr. Willson soon "brought to light the hidden things of darkness", condemning the herding together of diverse types; exposing the evil results of neglect to plan for air, sunshine, and space; and resisting every suggestion as to reconstruction or adaptation of old premises. In his opinion the best of the cells were out of date; while there were at least 70 which *ought not to be used.* What, then, was to be done? First and foremost suitable accommodation for the patients had to be provided: on this the Bishop laid great stress:

"Carefully considering the whole question I think I am warranted in concluding that the only remedy for the evils that now exist would be to build a house for this most important purpose on an eligible site in the vicinity of Hobart Town, on the model of one of the most approved Hospitals recently erected in England".

On several points his fellow Commissioners were not in full agreement with Dr. Willson; but they regularly paid tribute to his thoughtful and active benevolence. "We feel indebted to the Bishop", they said, "for the frank and straightforward manner in which he has brought this important question under our notice. We have long been painfully conscious of the many deficiences of the building now at our disposal, and we must with deep regret acknowledge that the cells are gloomy and ill-ventilated, that sufficient facilities are not afforded for that proper classification of the patients which the Bishop so justly advocates—and that, owing to the desultory and patchwork construction of the various compartments, the Asylum is far from being so well arranged as we could desire. But we canot admit that it is *a dismal place fit only for a prison, a house for the worst class of felons,* or that the yards and the ordinary wards are of the gloomy character attributed to them".

Never did the Bishop abandon the hope of seeing his dreams realised. He persisted in his campaign, collecting facts and figures from England, France, and Belgium, studying the latest medical discoveries, writing to professional publications, and corresponding with recognised authorities on mental ailments. If he did not gain his main point he did secure, useful and lasting reform. It is worthy of note that first-rate physicians of the present day, as well as officers of the Social Service Departments, are calling loudly for the very measures championed by Bishop Willson more than a century ago in his native land and in Australia.

What were the Bishop's qualifications in this particular field? Extracts from evidence given before a Joint Committee of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly appointed to consider correspondence between himself and the Government will demonstrate his right to speak with authority on the treatment and care of the Insane:—

"I was concerned in the management of a County Lunatic Asylum in Nottinghamshire, in England, for twelve or thirteen years. I was one of an Executive Board of seven. We met weekly...I have also visited the chief Institutions, both public and private, in England, and also made express journeys to France and Belgium for the same purpose, in order to obtain all the experience I could in their management. At a later period also I visited asylums in Italy and in the Australian dominions.

"I was elected an honorary member of a Voluntary Association, consisting of the Heads of Public Asylums in England, which met each year to investigate the best modes of improving the management of the Insane. They held their meetings at some one of the Public Asylums in England.

"I am aware of very great improvement in the management of the Insane in England of late years. That improvement was shown greatly in the number of cures effected, and also in the great amount of comfort and kind attention the Lunatics received. These improvements have been effected by the humane structure of the buildings, the removal of instruments of restraint, treating patients as far as possible like rational and sensible beings, making their dwellings as much like their ordinary houses as possible, and doing away with appearances of restraint.

"The site at Nottingham...was restricted in point of space, and a difficulty was experienced, in consequence, in finding proper employment for the inmates. The site was about 10 acres. The average number was from 200 to 300. They were employed in gardening, in trades, and in recreations. ... Work was always encouraged by rewards, but was never imposed: outdoor work was always preferred by the Managers over in-door work. Recreations of all sorts were always provided...From my information the sites chosen in England for all new Institutions have an area of not less than one acre to every four patients: I should be glad to see it much larger in this country.

"All the improved modes of treatment I have alluded to were put into operation at the Nottingham Asylum after I joined the Management, and were carried out with marked success, notwithstanding the limited accommodation".

Tasmania was at this time a long way behind England. Referring to the Asylum at New Norfolk the Bishop testified:

"The curative means is limited inasmuch as the space is small, the buildings very ill-adapted, the cells for the separate patients, both for those confined during the day, and the dormitories for the rest, are gloomy, ill-ventilated and confined ... The worst cells at Nottingham before the improvements were begun were not so bad as the average of the cells at New Norfolk. I am quite sure the buildings at New Norfolk cannot be converted so as to adapt them to the modern improved system. There is nothing in the character of the Inmates there that makes restraint more necessary than with patients in England—but the reverse.

"I believe that the patients of the convict class require less restraint than the free...Good wardsmen and attendants, well-paid, are absolutely essential under the most improved systems: and they should be well cared for. At New Norfolk they are not so: their quarters are very confined and uncomfortable".

Here we find the Bishop a precursor of Social Justice as well as a friend to the most friendless class in the community. Nor did he forget

the spiritual needs of the Catholics amongst the New Norfolk inmates. Until 1851 weekly visits to the Institution were made by the Bishop himself or by one of the Hobart clergy. Daily devotions were conducted by a warder specially chosen for the purpose. From 1851 to October, 1856, there was a resident Religious Instructor or Chaplain in the district, Fathers Odillo Woolfrey, William Bond, and Hugh Magorian serving in that capacity with a zeal that merited Dr. Willson's highest praise. Then, once more, the previous arrangement had to suffice until 1864, when the Bishop was able to find a pastor in the person of the Rev. Joseph Aloysius Sheehy, who had returned home after his ordination to the priesthood in the city of the Popes.

Outside his own diocese the "enlightened, humane, and practical" views of Bishop Willson gave rise to fruitful discussion. On the occasion of his journeys abroad he could never resist the urge to succour the sick and the afflicted. In Melbourne the public hospital won his unbounded admiration: but at the Mental Asylum he observed many defects that could be remedied by professional knowledge and expert advice. It was in great part due to his intervention that plans were prepared for a new and up-to-date building. Before the laying of the foundation stone the Bishop decided to make a personal examination of the site chosen. The desired opportunity offered when Bishop Goold was about to leave for Rome:

"Melbourne, 14th June, 1858.

"My ever dear Lord,

"May I beg of Your Lordship to pay an occasional visit to this diocese in my absence, and assist by your advice my good friend the Vicar-General. The episcopal jurisdiction of the Mission I give you in all its entirety. Praying Your Lordship's prayers for myself, and those confided to my spiritual care, I remain with the greatest esteem and most devoted attachment, your brother in Christ,

J. A. GOOLD,
Bp. of Melbourne".

A minute inspection of the area set aside for the new Asylum was Dr. Willson's first care. He did not hesitate to utter his strongest condemnation of the site to the Government of Victoria:—

"It is with deep regret that I venture to express, with all due deference, my disappointment on the selection made for the site of a building so *peculiar in its requirements* and *so important* to the *public throughout the Colony* both now and, it may be, for ages to come. In my humble judgment the site at Kew, selected for your intended building, has very few, if any, advantages over Yarra Bend. It is in what may be fairly termed a sequestered vale, having only one open view, and that not an extensive one—sombre, almost gloomy; and standing on a narrow peninsula running down to the river; it is peculiarly lonely—in fact there is nothing cheering about it ...

"I beg leave to state that there is a site within a quarter of a mile of that proposed, most eligible, with an extensive bird's eye view ... and having all the advantages to be desired for such an establishment ...

"The comfort of very many of our fellow-creatures for years to come, whether curable or incurable, to say nothing of the feelings of relatives and friends, will depend on the fixing of the site of this intended Asylum—I ought rather to say, Hospital for the Cure of the Infirm of Mind; and sound policy as well as humanity will dictate the propriety of indulging the hope and making an effort that each one who may become afflicted with, perhaps, the heaviest of human infirmities may be relieved or, by proper treatment in a proper place, restored to sorrowing friends, and to sweet liberty. And allow me to add, from my own experience in watching over the Insane, from the highest class in society to the lowest, I believe it would be wrong to despair of the recovery of any one, however desperate the case might appear to be".[2]

The wisdom of Dr. Willson's recommendations was recognised by the authorities in Melbourne. His views finally prevailed.

In New South Wales, too, the Hobart Bishop's writings and addresses exercised a far-reaching influence on public policy in reference to the treatment of mental illness. In 1863 the Legislative Assembly ordered to be printed a long letter in which Dr. Willson dealt with the Tarban Creek Asylum, describing it as "constructed chiefly for detaining in safe custody a large mass of human beings, crowded in every part, and not as a hospital to restore, if possible, the shattered or infirm of mind". Having referred in detail to certain grave defects and imperfections of that "gloomy and secluded abode", he went on:—

"Crime induces a State to erect Prisons in order to insure the public safety. True charity and Christian philanthropy, not unmingled with a reasonable share of worldly wisdom, will induce a Government to provide the very best means, not only for preventing the Insane injuring themselves and others, but also in procuring the best mode of treatment in the hope of effecting speedy recovery and a restoration of the afflicted to society; and I must observe the best writers on this important subject bear testimony that a greater percentage of cures can be effected in insanity than in any other ailment man is subject to, provided patients be treated at a *proper time,* in a *proper manner,* and in a *proper place.* Where, therefore, a State has the means and power of providing this inestimable blessing of proper treatment of this most pitiable and afflicted class it seems to me that duty, interest, humanity, and the common bonds of charity combine in pointing out the solemn obligation. No doubt there will be men of narrow minds in all communities who, from selfish motives and ignorance of what can be done, would willingly allow the infirm of mind to be removed from public view; detained, fed, and clothed, and left to linger out a doleful existence, at the least possible cost. When Mary Magdalene poured the box of precious ointment on Our Lord's feet the selfish and ignorant exclaimed: 'Why all this waste?'. No doubt the reasonable cost of proper treatment of the insane would be, by too many, considered 'waste' ".

The thoroughly Christian motives that ruled Bishop Willson in his lifelong struggle for the rights and welfare of the sick and helpless are made manifest in his correspondence with the New South Wales Government:

"You are aware that the Government of Victoria has determined to erect the proposed hospital for the infirm of mind on a site most beautiful and one of immense value, and Parliament has wisely and nobly voted £200,000 for its erection,

[2] *Lunatic Asylum Commission,* Victoria.

and that of two other similar institutions in the interior of their great Colony. Why, I may be allowed to ask, shall not New South Wales do the same? The wants of hundreds of her people are as great, and the means to relieve them as ample.

"When I pass through your magnificent city and observe the unmistakeable proofs of wealth and prosperity, the beautiful mansions of the rich, gigantic warehouses of the merchants, the extensive shops for retailing all that is useful and luxurious, the ponderous ships that bring you the choicest products for use and comfort all parts of the earth could offer, and carry away the wondrous riches of your gold fields, the millions upon millions of fleeces from your flocks, the tallow, etc., from your countless herds, and the oil from the great Pacific that finds its way hither by the skill of British seamen and the enterprise of your spirited shipowners; and, moreover, when I view the innumerable magnificent villas in the extensive suburbs of the City, and countless residences combining all that is elegant and stamped with comfort; and when I reflect that although I am at the antipodes of my fatherland still I am standing on British ground, a sensation of national pride and pleasure comes over me, and I express an earnest hope that being spared by God's goodness the calamities of war, famine and pestilence, this noble Colony may continue to prosper and increase, and become, as it deserves to be, a portion of a mighty empire. But excuse me for observing that a feeling of melancholy irresistably steals over me when I reflect that 900 (in round numbers) fellow beings—not criminals, but those afflicted by the Almighty's dispensation—are shut up within the walls of the unfitting Asylum at Tarban Creek, and in the frightful old Factory Prison at Parramatta with its doleful cells, and its iron barred doors, even for females. On a visit to the Asylum at Parramatta great cleanliness and order were evident in every part; no doubt the best is done for the patients under the existing circumstances. I am, however, encouraged to hope that on due consideration being given to this momentous subject a generous, just, wise and humane effort will at once be entered upon, so that the words of our Bessed Lord, recorded in the 25th chapter and 36th verse of St. Matthew's Gospel, may be applicable to everyone who has power to move in so noble and righteous a cause: 'I was sick and ye visited me: I was in prison and ye came to me' ".

Nowhere could the Bishop look upon human misery without being moved to pity, to protest, and to action. Numerous instances of his merciful intervention could be quoted based on records found not only in Van Diemen's Land but also in other colonies and in the home countries. One example will serve as an illustration. To the Chairman of the Committee on Lunacy a letter was addressed by Dr. Willson, dated Sydney, 19th August, 1863:—

"Permit me to inform you that yesterday I was allowed to go through the whole of Darlinghurst Gaol, and whilst there a person labouring under insanity was brought in. This unfortunate man, of respectable appearance, probably about 50 years of age, was placed in one of the long galleries—that which, I was informed, was generally used for lunatics—and in this doleful prison were two other insane men, one a native black, the other writhing from head to foot with a terrible nervous affection, truly a frightful object!

"For a patient requiring prompt and proficient attention to be placed in a prison for criminals of the worst class, and with such companions as I have referred to, appears to me to be a fact of very lamentable nature; and I shall rejoice to hear that such measures will be at once taken that will render it unnecessary that a fellow being afflicted by the dispensation of Almighty God with the loss of reason should be carried to a felon's jail as a necessary proceeding for him to obtain admittance to that Asylum which, it is presumed, is established for the cure of the

infirm of mind. I apprehend a gaol is no more a fitting place for a person with a deranged intellect to be taken to than a man who had a fractured limb".

As was to be expected, the Bishop did not escape criticism and even hostility: reformers invariably upset the complacent. But his work was appreciated by those qualified to pronounce judgment. In the *Journal of Mental Science* for January, 1865, in a special section dealing with Reports on the progress of Psychological Medicine several pages are devoted to a study of conditions in various parts of the world. Classed with men of world-wide renown as workers for reform in methods of dealing with the Insane we find the Bishop of Hobart:—

"In the *Journal of Mental Science* for January, 1863, was given the story of the abominations of the Yarra Bend Asylum, near Melbourne, the exposure of which, mainly owing to the benevolent zeal and persevering energy of the Right Reverend Dr. Willson, Catholic Bishop of Hobart Town, issued, as our readers know, in the appointment of our associate Dr. Paley as medical superintendent. Since he has been in charge of the Asylum, the greatest improvements have been effected; and it appears that all is now done that can be done for such a place. Unfortunately a badly selected site, and the ill-construction of a building which is over-crowded, are difficulties in the way of a complete success; and Dr. Willson has accordingly not ceased to urge strongly on the Government the desirability of erecting on a good site an additional small asylum, which might be used as a hospital for curable cases...

"As in Victoria, so in New South Wales, Bishop Willson was the first to call attention to the defects of these asylums; and we doubt not that he will be the last to be silent until these defects have been remedied. 'Where good is to be done or evil undone' says the Melbourne *Argus*, 'there the Roman Catholic Bishop of Tasmania is to be found, as much by inclination as in virtue of his office'. It was unavoidable that the Bishop, though conducting his benevolent crusade with great moderation, should wound the self-love of a self-satisfied medical superintendent. A man who is living contentedly in a system of which he is the founder or the advocate—how *vicious* soever it may be—is not easily persuaded that there are other and better things in heaven and earth than what are dreamt of in his philosophy...Heartily, therefore, do we sympathise with Bishop Willson in his zealous exertions; and even if he had painted the bad in colours a little too dark—which, we are bound to say, there is no reason to suspect—we could readily forgive so slight a fault in so great and good a cause..."

Having referred to the Bishop as "a man who had from pure motives of benevolence, visited very many asylums in different parts of the world, and had been an earnest reformer before reform was so fashionable as it is now—having, so long ago as 1831, fought a hard battle for a total reform in the Nottingham Asylum" the *Journal* ended its review in this wise:

"Those who are truly interested in the welfare of the insane, in whatever part of the world, must feel most thankful to the Right Reverend Bishop for the zeal and energy with which, through good report and through evil report, he presses forward the good work of reform, and will hope that the life of this veteran reformer may long be spared, that he may continue to plead so earnestly and well the cause of those unfortunate beings who, by reason of a great affliction, cannot plead for themselves".

We know with what devotion Bishop Willson made himself a very slave for the victims of Britain's transportation policy whether condemned to close confinement, toiling in gangs, or holding tickets-of-leave. Groups and individuals experienced the effects of his benign intercession. Not only of his own diocese could this be said: but wherever he became aware of distress he did all in his power to relieve it. He did not wait to be told that such services as his were needed: he went in search of the poor, the sick, the victims of neglect and of heartless legislation. His heart went out especially to men awaiting death as the penalty for their misdeeds. Hundreds of these sinners he had personally consoled and succoured in Van Diemen's Land. In Sydney he did not hesitate to make his voice heard. To the Chairman of a Select Committee enquiring into the state of Prisons in New South Wales he made a plea on behalf of the condemned:—

"At present these malefactors are allowed to leave their cells once or twice a day to take exercise in the open air. This is, of course, humane and proper; but with comparatively little cost or loss of any kind a much better plan may, in my humble judgment, be carried out. From my own experience with very many under sentence of death I found that depression of mind was frequently apparent, perhaps from physical causes as well as mental, and that no remedy was so effectual on such occasions as the open air. I need hardly observe that if a culprit be sinking in spirits, and his physical energy giving way, he becomes incapable of profiting by the time humanely allowed him by law, for preparing his soul to meet the Eternal Judge; and hence the desirability of giving him every reasonable opportunity of doing so. If, attached to the cells for the condemned, there is one small yard which they can use whenever they please throughout the whole day a remedy is at once obtained on this important head, and also all the inconveniences and objections removed which must arise from the system now pursued in Darlinghurst Gaol. This kind of arrangement has long been adopted in Tasmania, and is the plan carried out in all the prisons I am acquainted with, in England".

In recognizing the rights of conscience the Colonial Governments really showed the way to the Motherland. A splendid fight for religious freedom had been put up by Father Philip Conolly in Van Diemen's Land: the struggle had been continued and practically won by Father Therry. For Bishop Willson it was a question of seeing that Catholics were not maltreated in individual and isolated cases through the bigotry of some petty official. When the Bishop visited England, in 1853, he found that there was a move on foot to admit Catholic Chaplains to prisons and other Government detention houses. He supported[3] the petitions of the English hierarchy by putting his views before Lord Viscount Palmerston:

[3]Willson Papers.

"6 Manchester Street,
"Manchester Square,
"26th January, 1854.

"My Lord,

"Being aware of Your Lordship's most just and wise intention respecting the principle of the new regulations to be adopted for all prisons for the religious and moral treatment of Catholics I have the honour to offer, most respectfully the subjoined suggestions. Permit me, my Lord, to remark that these suggestions are not merely the speculations of the moment, but are in substance what have been fully carried out for the last ten years by authority of Her Majesty's Government, in Van Diemen's Land.

"Of the effect produced beyond the seas by the adoption of these just measures I believe no one can calculate the amount of evil prevented,—nor the amount of permanent good produced; and I feel assured, by carrying out fairly here the just principles embodied in the suggestions I now venture to offer the following benefits will be, more or less, the result, and thus not only secure becoming conduct in prison, but what is of infinitely more consequence, a well grounded hope, that when liberty shall be obtained either entirely by servitude, or partially by Ticket-of-Leave, perseverance in rectitude may be manifest.

1) All bickerings and dissensions among officials would be averted, as all regulations relative to spiritual matters would be authoritatively defined.
2) Hypocrisy in cunning and crafty-minded prisoners, whatever their religion might be, would be defeated.
3) The fears of the timid and well-inclined set at rest.
4) Lastly, but not the least important, a laudable emulation created in the minds of the Ministers of Religion, in striving to instruct the ignorant, and reform the hearts of their respective erring flocks.
5) This spirit of Christian zeal and charity I am sure Your Lordship will wish to see engendered in the beginning of this mighty experiment of reforming, within the boundaries of the United Kingdom all the criminals who may henceforth fall into the hands of justice.

"Sincerely wishing that the hopes and expectations even of the most sanguine and enthusiastic may be realised, when a fair trial has been given to the proposed system, ten or fifteen years hence.

"I have the honor to be, my Lord Viscount,
"Your Lordship's most humble servant,
"R. W. WILLSON,
"Catholic Bishop of Hobartown.

"The Right Hon., Lord Viscount Palmerston, M.P."

In default of some clear and authorised arrangement, the Bishop was convinced, narrow-minded officials would be unwilling to see Catholics in possession of the freedom so long denied in Britain. Therefore he suggested:—

(a) That an ecclesiastic, approved by the Catholic Bishops of England, should be recognised by the Government as having the general superintendence over all matters connected with Catholic prisoners in any of Her Majesty's gaols;

(b) That when numbers justify it a Chaplain should be appointed on the recommendation of the superintending Chaplain. Upon his advice, too, an appointment should be cancelled;

(c) That where there is no Chaplain attached to a prison the nearest

resident priest should be authorised to impart moral instructions;

(d) That where a sufficient number of Catholics would occupy the attention of a Schoolmaster one should be provided subject to the conditions laid down for Chaplains;

(e) That the superintending Chaplain should have power of visitation to see that duties were being attended to, and that the regulations were being observed.

(f) That books should be supplied, those intended for Catholics to have the Chaplain's approval;

(g) That fair and reasonable means should be employed to ascertain a prisoner's religion, that freedom of conscience be fully recognised, and that in case of illness a patient should have full liberty to select his spiritual guide;

(h) That fitting accommodation for divine worship should be made available in every prison.

The English Bishops felt grateful to their Hobart brother for having exerted his powerful influence in a question which was giving them so much concern at this time when the anti-Catholic feeling aroused by the restoration of the hierarchy had not yet spent its force.

It comes as something in the nature of a surprise to learn that the kind hearted Bishop Willson was no stranger even to the prisons of Rome itself. When an anti-Catholic agitator tried to stir up sectarian hate in Tasmania by writing: "A Roman prison is an awful place... only once a day a handful of corn is given, to be mixed with water, as food", the answer came: "I, too, have visited Roman prisons...and not being entirely a novice on prison matters, was anxious to examine minutely those of Rome. Some of them required considerable alterations in their arrangement...But I can state that I have been present when the rations were served out—have carefully examined and tasted them—and can affirm that it has never been my lot to see food so good and so plentiful in any jail in England (and I have seen many) or in France, New South Wales, Victoria, or Tasmania—I mean the felons' jails in Rome".[4]

Much more the Bishop could have said: but it did not suit his purpose in dealing with the point raised by an ignorant ranter. The Roman law-breakers got good food in abundance: there were other aspects of prison life not so deserving of approbation. Dr. Willson had, in fact, in 1847, taken it on himself to tell the responsible authorities their duty in reference to jails and prisoners. Stating that he held an appointment

[4]*Examiner*, 1-10-1861.

from the British Government to watch over the spiritual interests of Catholics transported to Van Diemen's Land and Norfolk Island, and that "ten thousand of these unfortunate persons claim him as their pastor, more than 3000 of them being under prison discipline", the Bishop of Hobart requested and obtained permission of the Governor of Rome to inspect the new prison in *Via Julia.* What was the result? Dr. Willson learned nothing that would be helpful in his struggle for justice and reform: on the contrary he asked the Romans to introduce improved methods in the administration and conduct of their own big house of detention.

"Because of the very contracted area over which the prison is erected", reported the Bishop, "it is impossible to make proper arrangements for separating and classifying more than 400 persons in such manner as to insure due regard being given to their moral and physical wants. The following evils appear to be the result:—

"(a) The herding together of the old and young, the most depraved and reckless, with those who are comparatively guiltless; sometimes even the innocent with the abandoned.

"(b) The supposed necessity of depriving certain classes of ever taking exercise in the open air, an *evil* the most *calamitous,* and one to which even criminals under sentence of death are not subject in any of the British dominions.

"(c) The existing in an atmosphere the most noxious, especially in hot weather, which brings destruction alike to mental and bodily health.

"(d) The deprivation of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, except twice a year, for certain criminals.

"(e) The total want of employment, either manual or mental".

These strictures applied to the section of the prison occupied by men. "In the part of the prison assigned for women", added the Bishop, "no provision is or can be made for *exercise in the open air.* Many of these unhappy persons, without reference to age, are confined to the same room for months together, and consequently evils of the most deplorable nature, both physical and moral, must be the result".

We may be quite assured that the Governor of Rome and his agents looked with unfriendly eye on this foreign prelate when they read:

"I am constrained with great pain to state that, with the exception of a military prison in the north of France, I have never visited one where defects of such magnitude exist, and I venture with all humility to implore the Secretary of State in the depth of charity, for the love of Him who will exclaim at the last day, 'Come ye blessed...for I was in prison and you came to me', to cause such remedies to be applied as will remove the evils which exist in this or other places, so that the

prisons of the chief city of the Christian world may be models for every nation".

Seven years after this, Dr. Willson once more examined conditions in the prison of the city by the Tiber. Again he saw nothing to rejoice his heart: and he did not omit to say so. Taking all the circumstances into account it will be admitted that his courage was not less magnificent than his charity.

(To be continued)

J. H. CULLEN.

* * * *

CATECHIZING DURING MASS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

In a recent number of the *Record*—October, 1949—the question was discussed regarding catechizing children during the time of Mass. As the *Record* pointed out it would be strange indeed to use the time of Mass for such a purpose, as the children could neither attend to the Mass nor listen to the instruction.

But we must concede something more than toleration to the custom of explaining the Mass and its ceremonies to children during the time of a Mission. This has been a practice of the Redemptorist Fathers over the years—ever since the days of St. Alphonsus. But it does not owe its origin to the Redemptorists, but to the Council of Trent. It came about in this way. After the Fathers of the Council had subjected the objection raised to the use of Latin in Church Services to a thorough examination—They unanimously declared, that although the Mass embodied a vast amount of religious instruction, they still deemed it inexpedient that the Holy Sacrifice should be everywhere celebrated in the vernacular; that on the contrary, the usage authorized by the Holy Roman Church should everywhere be maintained.

But in order that the use of Latin may not be an obstacle to the understanding of the wealth and beauty of divine worship, and that the people may understand clearly the meaning of the celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the Council decreed as follows: "But in order that the sheep of Christ may not hunger and that the children may not ask for bread without there being someone to break it to them, the Council commands pastors of souls, that *during the celebration of Mass* they frequently explain some part of what has been read in the Mass; and that especially on Sundays and holidays they give instruction on some mystery of this most Holy Sacrifice". *Session 22, Ch. 8.*

T. F. ROCHE, C.SS.R.

Dogmatic Theology

THE THEOLOGY OF THE MASS. II.

THE ONE TRUE SACRIFICE OF THE NEW LAW (Continued).

THE VOICE OF GOD.

"God, who, at sundry times and in divers manners, spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all, in these days, hath spoken to us by His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the world".[1]

In his recent Encyclical, "Humani Generis",[2] the Supreme Pontiff reminded theologians that the most noble office of theology is to show how a doctrine defined by the Church is contained in the sources of revelation in that sense in which it has been defined by the Church. That is the aim of the present chapter of our work. We intend to dissipate the darkness of protestant error concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass by shedding upon it the light of God's revelation. We shall listen first to the voice of God through the prophets, and secondly to the voice of Truth Incarnate.

I.—THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE MASS:

a) *The Sacrifice of Melchisedech, type of Christ the Priest*:

In Psalm 109, v. 4, we read: "The Lord hath sworn, and he will not repent: Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech".

No one may doubt for an instant that these words were spoken prophetically of Christ Our Saviour. St. Paul explicitly declared that they refer to Christ, the Priest (Hebrews, 5, 6-10; 6, 20; 7, 1), while Our Lord (Mt. 22, 41-46), St. Peter (Acts, 2, 34 ff), and St. Paul (1 Cor. 15, 25; Hebrews, 1, 13; 10, 13) clearly proclaimed the messianic nature of the psalm.

Now, these words lucidly teach us three important truths: first, that Christ is a priest and, therefore, offers a true sacrifice, for, the terms "priesthood" and "sacrifice" are correlative; second, that He exercizes His priesthood according to the rite, or likeness, of Melchisedech by offering a sacrifice like unto the sacrifice of Melchisedech; third, that He exercizes His priesthood perpetually, unceasingly offering sacrifice according to the rite predicted.

What, then, was the nature of Melchisedech's sacrifice? We are told in Genesis, 14, 18: "Melchisedech, the King of Salem, brought for-

---

[1]Hebrews, 1, 1-2.
[2]12th Aug., 1950.

ward bread and wine, for he was a priest of God Most High, and he blessed him (Abram).

It must be conceded that the Hebrew word "hozeh", which we translated by "brought forward", does not necessarily of itself mean that Melchisedech offered a true sacrifice of bread and wine. It may mean that, or it may mean simply that he brought the food to Abram and his men. From the word itself, therefore, we may lawfully conclude only that the offering of a true sacrifice is not excluded. Now, it is a fundamental rule of hermeneutics that in such cases the true meaning of an ambiguous word must be sought in the immediate context. And the present context does not leave us in any doubt. It tells us that Melchisedech offered, or proffered, bread and wine "because he was a priest of God Most High". Melchisedech, therefore, made a priestly oblation, offered a true sacrifice of bread and wine. Certainly, no other explanation satisfies the context, though the Protestant divines move heaven and earth to escape this conclusion.

Some maintain that Melchisedech merely offered the food to Abram and his followers for their refreshment. But the context protests that they had no need of it because they had already eaten to satiety of the abundant prey they had captured (v. 11, 12, 16, 23, 24). Such being the case, the very common gift of bread and wine, the Jewish jejunal fare, certainly was not such a munificient and regal gift that Abram would have been moved to repay Melchisedech with "the tithes of all he possessed". (v. 20). Besides, the text clearly states that Melchisedech approached Abram in his rôle and dignity of priest of the Most High, and that as such he offered bread and wine. But the mere presentation of food to Abram certainly would not constitute a true priestly action. On the other hand, the sacerdotal action performed by Melchisedech cannot have consisted in a simple blessing bestowed on the patriarch, because in the Old Testament the act of blessing was not, in itself, a priestly action, nor was it reserved to priests, but used commonly by kings, fathers of families, and between friends.

Every part of the narration proclaims the fact that Melchisedech offered a true sacrifice of bread and wine. The Masoretes certainly understood the text in this sense,[3] and so do the Jewish commentators.[4]

[3]The punctuation inserted in the Masoretic text makes the priestly action of Melchisedech consist in the offering of bread and wine, and excludes the interpretation which would restrict it to a simple blessing. The text: "Melchisedech, King of Salem, proffered bread and wine, being a priest of the Most High; and he blessed him".

[4]In Bereschit-Rabba (a 6th century commentary on Genesis) R. Samuel com-

The sense of the text having been clarified, we may now confect our argument:

Christ is a priest forever according to the sacerdotal rite of Melchisedech. But sacrifice and priesthood are correlative, and from the nature of one we know the nature of the other, for "every high priest is constituted to offer gifts and sacrifices" (Hebrews, 8, 3). Therefore, Christ offered a sacrifice similar to the sacrifice of Melchisedech. Now, Melchisedech sacrificed in bread and wine, nor is there any indication in Sacred Scripture of his having offered any other kind of sacrifice. Therefore, Christ, Our Lord, offered a sacrifice in bread and wine. But in the Last Supper alone did Christ the priest perform a sacred rite in bread and wine. Hence, we must conclude that the consecration of bread and wine at the Last Supper was a true sacrifice, otherwise we would be forced to admit that the type of Melchisedech was never fulfilled in Christ the priest. Therefore, the Mass, in which, at Christ's command, we celebrate the same rite which Our Lord performed at the Last Supper, is a true and proper sacrifice.

If any doubt remained as regards this conclusion, it would be completely removed by the universal voice of Sacred Tradition. From the days of Cyprian in the West, and Clement of Alexandria in the East, the Fathers of the Church, with one voice, explicitly taught that Melchisedech offered a true sacrifice which was a figure of the great Christian Sacrifice of the Mass.[5] St. John Damascene, into whom all the rivulets of Tradition flowed, thus gave to posterity the faith of its Fathers: "Melchisedech, priest of the Most High, received Abraham as he returned from the slaughter of the foreigners. That altar prefigured this mystic christian altar, just as that priest bore the figure and image of the true priest, Christ. For, it is said: "Thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech". (De Fide Orthodoxa, 4, 13).

---

ments on the text thus: "Melchisedech performed an act of priesthood: he offered a sacrifice of bread and wine to God Holy and Blessed".

Rabba Phinees, in Chap. 28 of Numbers: "In the days of the Messias all sacrifice of bread and wine will not cease: so we are taught in Genesis, c. 14: 'And Melchisedech, King of Salem, proffered bread and wine': so Melchisedech, that is the King-Messias, will retain the sacrifice of bread and wine, as it is stated in Psalm 110: "Thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech". (Quoted by Fr. Einig, De Eucharistia, c. 3, a. 1 (1914), p. 219 in nota). A beautiful, though pathetic, tribute to the Sacrifice of the Mass.

[5]Clement of Alex., Stromata, 4, 25; Cyprian, Epist. 63, 4; Ephraem, Hymni Azymorum, hymn 2; Eusebius Caesar., Demonstrationes, 5, 3; Chrysostomus, In Genesin, Nom. 35, 5; Ambrose, De Mysteriis, 8, 45 ff; Jerome, In Psalm. 109; Epist. 73, 3; Augustine, Ep. 177, 12; In Ps. 33, 1, 5 ff; De Civitate Dei, 16, 22; 17, 17; 18, 35; Leo M. Sermon 5, 3.

Not without very good reason, then, did the Council of Trent, in its decree on the institution of the Mass at the Last Supper, appeal to the Melchisedechan prophecy in these words: "Christ, manifesting Himself as a priest constituted forever according to the order of Melchisedech, offered to God, His Father, His own body and blood under the species of bread and wine, and commanded His Apostles and their successors in the priesthood to offer Him under the same signs". (Denzinger, Enchridion Symbolorum, n. 938).

b) *The Prophecy of Malachias,* ch. 1, v. 6-11.

Through the mouth of the Prophet, Almighty God first severely reprimands the priests for their neglect and contempt in the matter of offering sacrifices. On the altar of sacrifice they had placed polluted bread and maimed animals that no longer served a useful purpose for men, and then in arrant hypocrisy denied they had despised the name of Jahveh (vv. 6 ff.). Then there is pronounced the famous prophecy of the clean oblation, in which there is predicted a new dispensation with a new, all-pleasing sacrifice as its central rite: "I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts: and I will not accept a gift from your hand. For, from the rising of the sun even to the going down thereof, my name is great among the Gentiles: and in every place there is sacrificed and offered to my name a clean oblation. For my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts". (v. 10-11).[6]

This prophecy undoubtedly contains three truths concerning the new sacrifice: firstly, it is a true and proper external sacrifice, not merely a metaphorical one such as the offering of prayer or one's dispositions to God, as the Protestant innovators maintain. Secondly, the sacrifice is foretold as belonging to the Messianic Kingdom to be established on earth. Thirdly, the sacrifice is all-pleasing to God and universally celebrated. We shall consider each point in turn.

I) *A true, external sacrifice, or visible offering, is foretold.*

---

[6]The Prophet's description resembles a masterly portrait. The background is dark with the negligences, avarice, sacrileges, and hypocrisy of the chosen people. Against this background there is a resplendent halo, representing the mighty name of Jahveh, the light of which pervades the whole world. Beneath this brilliant crown there is depicted the chaste scene of the perfectly-acceptable sacrifice which the peoples of the world offer to God Most High. From the sacrifice offered come countless brilliant rays of light, some rising to become fused with the lustrous glory of the halo, signifying the honour and praise that is given to God, others penetrating the nations of the world, falling upon the peoples gathered around the altar of sacrifice, all offering the immaculate victim in one united act of adoration, thanksgiving, propitiation, and petition, all transformed by the effusion of divine life and light which unite men with God in the embrace of friendship and love.

This is clear, above all, from the terms employed by the prophet. They are strictly sacrificial terms, and by their very variety are meant to convey most strikingly that the "clean oblation" is not only placed in antithesis to the countless sacrifices of the temple, not only to be substituted for all the sacrifices, bloody and unbloody, that formed the heart of the Jewish religion, but that, like them, it is a true, external, visible sacrifice which forms the heart of the new public cult of God. For a full appreciation of these terms we must have recourse to the Hebrew text.

a) The Hebrew word "Muktar", which the Vulgate renders as "there is sacrifice", means "there is the sweet odour of incense", and although it strictly designated a sacrifice of incense offered on the golden altar, it was also used to signify every kind of sacrifice. (cf. Leviticus, 1, 9-17; 3, 11-16; 4, 10-35). The important thing to note, however, is that the term was never used to mean a metaphorical sacrifice, the offering of prayer or hymn of praise, but always and in every case, of the 146 places in which it occurs in sacred scripture, it means a true, external, visible sacrifice. The prophet foretells, then, that "in every place there shall be the sweet odour of a true, visible sacrifice".[7]

b) The Hebrew word "Muggash" means "is offered", as the Vulgate translates it. In the prophecy of Malachias it is used thrice with the undoubted meaning of a true, external sacrifice (1, 7-8; 2, 13; 3, 3), and in several places in Sacred Scripture it is employed in the same sense. (cf. Exodus, 32, 6; Leviticus, 2, 8; 8, 14; Judges, 6, 18; Amos, 5, 25). It is important to note that the word is never used of a metaphorical sacrifice without some qualification being added to show that it is being used in a loose sense, e.g., a sacrifice of praise, of justice, or of a contrite spirit. Since no such explanation is here forthcoming, and since the word is found thrice in the immediate context in the strict sense of external, physical sacrifice, all the canons of hermeneutics and common sense postulate that in verse 11 it must be accepted in the same sense.

---

[7]As to whether the prophecy also indicates the use of incense in the Mass, universally used in the East and found in our solemn Mass, we would not care to judge. Many exegetes affirm that it does. (cf. Knabenbauer, Comment. in prophetas minores, pars altera, Paris, 1886, p. 440). Certainly, the ceremony of using incense at Mass did not happen just by chance and, de facto, the prophecy is fulfilled to the very letter.

c) The term "minchah" is translated as "clean oblation". It is the most expressive of all three words in the prophecy, because it is the technical term par excellence to denote a true, external, visible sacrifice in the strict sense. The universal consensus of exegetes is that the word is never found in Scripture with the meaning of internal, metaphorical sacrifice. Moreover, in sacred usage only once or twice does it mean a bloody sacrifice. (1 Kings, 2, 17; ?; Genesis, 4, 4). In the second of these two places, which seems the only real exception, the bloody sacrifice of Abel is called "minchah", perhaps for the reason that it is compared with the unbloody sacrifice of Cain, and therefore the sacred writer found it convenient to designate both sacrifices by the same term. Furthermore, in strict liturgical usage, that is, in those places of Sacred Scripture where the liturgical precepts are laid down, and from which the true norm for understanding the significance of liturgical terms must, in consequence, be formed, the word "minchah" is always used as the technical term to denote unbloody sacrifices of food. (cf. Levit. 2, 1, ff; 6, 7-13; 7-9; Numbers, 15, 4.)

The conclusion drawn from our study of these three terms leaves no room whatsoever for the completely arbitrary opinion of Protestants who would see in the prophecy a mere spiritual, internal, metaphorical sacrifice. The only reasonable interpretation of the passage is this: "In every place there is the sweet savour of sacrifice; of a true, external, visible sacrifice; of a clean sacrifice without the shedding of blood, offered to the glory of my name".

II) *The sacrifice is to be offered in Messianic times*:—

This is clear for many reasons. Firstly, from the predicted universality of the public worship of the one true God, which is vividly expressed in the phrases: "from the rising of the sun till the going down thereof", "in every place", and "among the peoples"; (the word "hagoim", peoples, means the nations of the gentile-world, in opposition to the Jewish race). Secondly, from the predicted abolition of the Mosaic Law, through the cessation of its sacrifices ("I will not accept a gift from your hand"), and from the fact that the new sacrifice is to be offered universally, whereas under the Mosaic Law it was lawful to offer sacrifice only in Jerusalem.

According to the Prophets, the universal worship of God among the peoples of the earth, and the abolition of the Mosaic Law, were to be the characteristic marks of Messianic times. (cf. Psalms 21, 28; 71,

10; Isaias, 11, 9; 49, 6; 60, 9; 66, 19; Amos, 9, 12; Micheas, 4, 2; Jeremias, 3, 16; Micheas, 7, 11). In no way were these marks of the prophecy certified at the time of Malachias. On the other hand, the use of the present tense in uttering the great prophecy does not cause the slightest difficulty. Everyone knows that the charisma of prophecy was exercized in such a way that the prophet described the future event as present to himself, as though it were actually being realized before his eyes. Thus, e.g., did Isaias foretell the Virgin-birth of Our Lord: "Behold, a virgin-pregnant and bringing forth a child". (7, 14; Hebrew text).

III) *That the predicted universal sacrifice is all-pleasing to God is too evident to need any comment.*

We may now construct our argument:

The characteristic marks of the sacrifice promised through Malachias are verified solely and perfectly in the holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Search as one will, no other rite can be found which bears all those characteristics.

It is true that the Sacrifice of the Cross was offered in the Messianic era, but it was offered once only, not "from the rising of the sun to its going down". Besides, it was not an unbloody sacrifice, nor was it offered "in every place".

The pagan sacrifices are neither new nor clean, and certainly they give no honour to God. A spiritual, metaphorical sacrifice of prayerful praise and adoration is neither new nor has it anything to do with the type of sacrifice foretold; certainly it is not "minchah".

But the august sacrifice of our altars is indeed a new sacrifice, offered from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, among all the peoples of the world. It is a true, visible, unbloody sacrifice, and indeed, a sacrifice in food, insofar as the victim is offered under the appearances of bread and wine. Finally, it is pre-eminently the "clean oblation" which cannot be defiled by any unworthiness or malice on the part of those who offer the Immaculate Victim infinitely pleasing to God.

Therefore the Mass is the one true sacrifice foretold by God through Malachias, His prophet.

If we turn our eyes to Sacred Tradition we find that from the very earliest of Christian documents (the Didache or Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles, written towards the end of the 1st century),[8] and from then

[8] C. 14, n. 1: "Coming together on Sundays, break the bread and give thanks, after having confessed your sins, that your sacrifice may be spotless... This is the sacrifice foretold by the Lord: In every place and time let there be offered to me a clean sacrifice".

right through the line of the Fathers—Justin, Irenaeus, Eusebius, John Chrysostom, Augustine, John Damascene, to quote but a few[9]—it is explicitly and unceasingly taught that the Mass is the great Sacrifice foretold by Malachias. This universal voice of Tradition is in itself an irrefragable proof that this truth was revealed by God to the Apostles and, consequently, it must be held by all to be of divine faith.

No one, therefore, unless blinded by prejudice or labouring under ignorance, will deny that the Council of Trent had every right solemnly to pronounce this truth in its Decree on the Mass: "This, indeed, is that clean oblation, which cannot be defiled by any unworthiness or malice on the part of those who offer it; that clean oblation which the Lord foretold through Malachias would be offered in every place to His name, which would be great among the peoples" (Denzinger, n. 938).

II.—THE NEW TESTAMENT AND THE MASS:—

a) *The Words of Institution*:

Everyone knows that the Mass is essentially a repetition of the rite performed by Our Lord at the Last Supper when He changed the bread and wine into His body and blood. "Do this," He commanded, "in memory of me". The question then presents itself: Did Christ offer a true sacrifice at the Last Supper? If He did, it is quite evident that the Mass is a true sacrifice.

All, even the Protestant theologians, unreservedly admit that the terms used by Christ evidently proclaim the offering of a true sacrifice. Biblical usage, both of the Old and the New Testament will not permit any denial of this point. The phrases "to give one's body for others", "to shed one's blood for the remission of sins", and such like, mean only the offering of oneself in true sacrifices.[10]

But a difference arises as to what sacrifice is indicated by these sacrificial phrases. The Protestants maintain that the words of Christ: "This is my body which is given for you", and "this is the chalice of my blood which is shed for you", refer directly and exclusively to the sacrifice of the Cross to be offered on the morrow. Catholic theologians,

---

[9]St. Justin, Dialogue, c. 41; St. Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, Bk. 4, c 17; n. 5; Eusebius, Demonstratio Evangelica, Bk. 1, c 10; St. Chrysostom, Adversus Judaeos, 5, 12; St. Augustine, De Civitate Dei, 18, 35; St. John Damascene, De Fide Orthodoxa, Bk. 4, c 14, n. 42).

[10]Thus, e.g., it is said of the sacrifice of the Cross: "Christ...gave himself for our sins". (Galatians, 1, 4; cf. 2, 20; 1 Tim. 2, 6; Tit. 2, 14.) "The Son of Man has come to give his life a redemption for many". (Mt. 20, 28; Mc. 10, 45; cf. Acts, 20, 28; Romans, 3, 25; 5, 9; Ephesians, 1, 7; 2, 13; Colossians, 1, 14-20; 1 Peter, 1, 2, 19; 1 John, 1, 7.)

Thus, also in the Old Testament. Cf. Leviticus, 14, 17; 17, 11; Numbers, 18, 17; Deuteronomy, 12, 27.

on the other hand, assert that the words of Christ refer directly to the sacrifice of His body and blood offered there in the supper-room, under the appearances of bread and wine (although reference to the Sacrifice of the Cross is not necessarily excluded), and, consequently, that the Mass is a true sacrifice instituted by Christ on that occasion.

That the Catholic interpretation of the words is correct becomes evident from a study of the original Greek text. Firstly, we perceive that only present participles are used in these phrases, the text reading thus: "This is my body given (didomenon) for you" (Lc. 22, 19); "This is my blood shed (ekchunnomenon) for you" (Mt. 26, 18; Mc. 14, 24; Lc. 22, 20). Now, the use of these present participles clearly indicates that the body of Christ is being given for men and His blood being shed (that is, offered in true sacrifice) here and now in the rite being performed by Christ, not at some future time. Why?—Because in the style of New Testament Greek, wherever a *present participle* is used definitely as a participle it can denote either present or past time, but not the future. This rule is inviolate particularly if the participle is used in conjunction with a finite verb in the present tense, which precisely is the case in the words of institution: "This *is* my body....given for you"; "This is my blood....shed for you".[11]

Secondly, St. Luke leaves no room for doubt in this matter. He records Our Lord as saying that His blood is offered in sacrifice *precisely and formally as contained in the chalice* present in His hands, that is, formally as present sacramentally under the species of wine. Now, this cannot refer directly to the sacrifice of the Cross, in which the blood of Christ was not offered in a chalice nor offered under the appearances of wine or any creature. Therefore, we must conclude that the Blood of Christ, and likewise His Body, were offered in a true sacrifice in the rite celebrated at the Last Supper. If you consult the original text you will see this reading: "This is the *chalice,* the New Testament in my blood, *poured out* for you". (Lc. 22, 20). In saying that the *chalice* is being poured out, Our Lord used a metonomy found in every-day speech, naming the container for the thing contained. But, it would be absurd to use such an expression unless the chalice actually contained the blood, and unless the blood as *actually and formally contained in the chalice* is being poured out, that is, as we have seen, offered in true sacrifice.

---

[11]Cf. Knabenbauer, Comment. in Mt., pars altera, p. 442, ed. 1903; Beelen, Grammatica Graecitatis N. Testamenti, p. 374, Louvain, ed. 1875.

Now, if we consider those two reasons together, the one drawing strength from the other, we are surely in possession of a probative argument that the rite instituted by Christ is, indeed, a true sacrifice.

Thirdly, a confirmative argument of no slight value is drawn from the fact that Christ, Our Lord, when instituting the Eucharist, said that His Blood was "the blood of the New Testament" (Mt. and Mc), or that the chalice itself was "the New Testament in my blood". (Lc.). The New Covenant, then, like the Old, is sealed and ratified by blood. But the blood which sealed the Old Covenant was *blood of sacrifice,* as we know from Exodus, 24, 4-11: ... "They offered holocausts, and sacrificed pacific victims of calves to the Lord. And Moses...took the blood and sprinkled it upon the people, and he said: *This is the blood of the covenant* which the Lord hath made with you". No one can fail to see the perfect parallelism between those last words and those spoken by Christ when He instituted the New Covenant; surely His words were vividly significant when they fell on the ears of the Apostles. To Jewish minds they would be a striking sacrificial expression which could mean only one thing: The New Covenant was at that moment being sealed by the blood of a true sacrifice, even as the Old had been. Now the perfect Testament was receiving a perfect seal: the seal of the blood of Christ, its author and consummator, contained in the chalice under the appearances of wine and, as such, offered to God the father: "This is the chalice, the New Testament in my blood, which is (even now) being poured out for you".[12]

b) *The Testimony of St. Paul*:—

St. Paul indubitably held that the celebration of the Eucharistic rite is an objective showing forth of the death of Christ: "As often as you eat this bread and drink this chalice, you show forth the death of

---

[12]As regards the Vulgate, the giving of Christ's body is expressed in the present tense in Lc, 22, 19; and the shedding of blood is similarly expressed in some ancient codices of the Latin version and the Vulgate; (e.g. in codice Cantabrigensi, Fuldensi, Mediolanensi) which belong to the 6th century, and in codice Vercellensi, which dates to the 4th century. In the Clementine Vulgate, the giving of Christ's body is translated in the future tense in Mt. and Mc., and the shedding of the blood is referred to the future in all three Synoptics. This is not entirely opposed to the reading of the original text, which uses only present participles, because in the Eucharistic rite instituted by Christ two things may, and should, be considered: firstly, the unbloody sacrifice offered in the Cenacle; secondly, the relation of that sacrifice to the bloody sacrifice of Calvary: the Mass is essentially a relative sacrifice. This second aspect is stressed in the Clementine Vulgate, but it does not give the full force of the original text, which must be our ultimate guide in these matters. (Cf. Ency. "Providentissimus Deus", of Leo XIII, 18th Nov., 1893; Denzinger, n. 1941 ff.)

the Lord until he come". (1 Cor. 11, 26.) But we do not understand at all how the Mass can be said truly and objectively to show forth the sacrifice of the Cross unless the body and blood of Christ be not only present, but present under *sacrificial conditions.* Besides, St. Paul, in giving the form of the consecration of the chalice, repeats, with St. Luke, that the blood in the chalice is the seal of the New Covenant: "This chalice is the new testament in my blood". (1 Cor. 11, 25.) From this we gather that the blood in the chalice is, here and now, the blood of a victim of sacrifice.

However, that the Mass was for St. Paul a true sacrifice is proved apodictically from his first Epistle to the Corinthians, c 10, v. 18-21, where the Apostle compares and contrasts the Eucharistic Sacrifice with the sacrifices of the Jews and Gentiles. Warning the faithful against taking part in the sacrificial banquets of the pagans, he points out the heinousness of such a crime by recalling all that he had taught them concerning the holiness and dignity of the great Christian Sacrifice. "Behold, he writes, behold Israel according to the flesh. Are not they that eat of the victims of sacrifice partakers of the altar? ... The things which the heathens sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils and not to God. And I would not that you should be made partakers with devils. You cannot drink the chalice of the Lord and the chalice of devils: you cannot be partakers of the table (trapeza = altar) of the Lord, and of the table (= altar) of devils".[13]

Now, if the Apostle's argument has any force at all surely it is centred in this, that the partaking of the Eucharist is for us Christians a participation in a *true sacrifice of Christ's body and blood,* just as the eating of the idol—offerings, and the eating of victims immolated on the Jewish altars was, for Jew and pagan, a participation in a *true sacrifice.* By the antithesis which St. Paul places between the two altars he clearly teaches that a true sacrifice is offered on the Christian altar of the Eucharist, not less than on the Jewish and pagan altars. Otherwise the antithesis would not exist, and the Apostle's argument would be futile, absurd.

This consideration led St. Robert Bellarmine to exclaim most forcefully that, "Sacred Scripture, in the writings of St. Paul, so clearly

[13]The Greek word "trapeza" is equivalent to "altar"; the meats offered in sacrifice were carried thence to those partaking of the sacrificial banquet; (cf. Isaias, 65, 11; Ezechias, 44, 15 ff; Malachias, 1, 7.). The pagans held that the deity to whom the sacrifice was being offered was the principal banquetter, presiding over the table.

compares the Lord's Supper with the sacrifices of the Jews and Gentiles, that he must be completely blind who does not see that, in St. Paul's teaching, the Mass is indeed a sacrifice".[14]

It is interesting to note, moreover, that St. Paul's expression: "The altar of the Lord", is found twice in the Prophecy of Malachias in close proximity to the great prediction of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. (Malachias, 1, 7; 1, 12). No doubt it was partly, at least, for this reason that the Council of Trent, when dealing with the Mass, in Session 22, ch. 1, referred to them both in the one passage, thus uniting the promise and the fulfilment: "And this (the Mass) is that clean oblation...which the Lord foretold through Malachias, and to which Paul, the Apostle, not obscurely refers when, writing to the Corinthians, he says that those who have been defiled by partaking of the table of the devils, cannot become partakers of the table of the Lord; in both cases meaning "altar" when he says "table". (Denzinger, n. 939).

In his Epistle to the Hebrews, the Apostle repeats the same teaching concerning the sacrificial nature of the Mass. He reminds us that we Christians "have an altar whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle"; i.e., the Jews. (c. 13, v. 10.) In this text the "altar" cannot mean the Cross, as some maintain, because the Apostle plainly speaks of a *sacrificial eating* of the victim sacrificed on the altar, in opposition to the eating of the victims of the Jewish sacrifices. Furthermore, the Jews are not excluded from eating, that is, spiritually partaking of the fruits of the sacrifice of the Cross. There Christ died, and merited all graces, for all men, Jews included; and the graces sufficient for salvation, which the Jews daily receive, are a true spiritual eating of Calvary's Sacrifice. No! St. Paul is clearly speaking of the sacrificial eating of the Victim of the great Sacrifice which forms the heart of the Christian religion, and which is daily celebrated on our altars,—the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, offered under the sacramental species of bread and wine.

There can be no doubt, then, that for St. Paul the Mass is, indeed, a true sacrifice. This truth he received "from the Lord", and faithfully imparted to the peoples of the world, in order that from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof the name of God might be magnified unceasingly through the clean oblation of Christ's body and blood, immolated beneath the humble veils of bread and wine by the divinely-tempered sword of a priestly tongue.

---

[14]De Controversiis, Bk. 2, c. 15, n. 35.

An Objection:

Protestant scholars, perceiving the undeniable force of the arguments we have drawn from St. Paul, seek to destroy them effectively by an appeal to the Epistle to the Hebrews, c. 10, v. 1-14. We leave it to the reader to examine the passage carefully.

The Protestants argue in this wise:

In the Old Testament, sacrifices were continually repeated, because they were not sufficiently efficacious to take away sin, "otherwise they would have ceased to be offered". Christ came; and, "we are sanctified by the oblation of the body of Christ *once*"; "for, *by one oblation* he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified... Therefore any new sacrifice is excluded, even the repeated offering of Christ's Body. Hence, the Mass is not a sacrifice.

Reply: 1st, The conclusion exceeds the premisses of the argument.

Almighty God had demanded condign satisfaction for sin, that is, reparation in accordance with rigorous justice. That meant that the act of reparation had to be of infinite moral value, even as the offence had been infinite. For that reason, the propitiatory sacrifices of the Old Law, being always finite, were not sufficient for the purpose. Hence they were continually repeated in satisfaction for sins not yet expiated. They bore witness to their own insufficiency. (cf. 10, 3.)

But, when Christ died on the Cross, He offered satisfaction of infinite value, condign reparation for all sins. What follows from that? Only this: no new victim is required, or no new offering of the same Victim, *in order to render to God new and more ample satisfaction for sin.* Nothing else follows; nothing else was in St. Paul's mind, as is readily seen from the matter of his argument.

Now, the Mass is not thereby excluded, because in the Mass Christ no longer merits or satisfies, but the sin-satisfying value of the one bloody and penal sacrifice of Calvary is *applied* to men.

Reply: 2nd, The objection *ignores the scope* of St. Paul's argument.

St. Paul had no intention of comparing *the cult of the Church* with the Mosaic cult or with the sacrifice of the Cross; his sole aim was to compare the legal sacrifices of the Old Testament with the sacrifice of the Cross. This is evident to all who can read. He opposes the efficacy of the one sacrifice of the Cross to the inefficacy of the oft-repeated Jewish sacrifices. No matter how often the latter were repeated, there still remained "the conscience of sin". They simply could not satisfy for sin.

When, therefore, the Apostle immediately adds: "By one oblation ....", he does not intend to exclude the repetition of any sacrifice, but only of such sacrifice as would suppose that satisfaction had not yet fully been made, as did the Jewish sacrifices. But this cannot be asserted of the Sacrifice of the Mass, which, as we have seen, St. Paul quite clearly taught to be the daily sacrifice of the Christian religion.

Hence, the Council of Sens logically stated: "As to all those texts of the Apostle, one and the same answer must be given: they should all be understood of that oblation whereby Christ offered Himself on the Cross in the visible form of His body *to expiate the sins of the whole world*".

* * * *

The Voice of God, recorded in Sacred Scripture, has told us in clear accents that the Mass is a true and proper sacrifice. This is the Faith that has sounded through the centuries, diligently and unceasingly preached by the Voice of our Fathers in every age and country, lovingly embraced and gratefully cherished by the faithful. Both Luther and Calvin openly conceded that "the multitude of the Fathers and ancient Christian practice" testify to the truth that the Mass is a sacrifice. In rejecting that unanimous vote of Christianity they were forced into the incredibly audacious admission that the universal Church had erred blasphemously at its very heart for fifteen hundred years! It would take volumes to record the teaching of the individual Fathers on this point of doctrine. Let an Anglican speak for us, a man of unquestionable erudition in patristic theology, John Ernest Grabe (+ 1711):

"It is certain that St. Irenaeus and the other Fathers whose writings have come down to us, both those who saw the Apostles and those who immediately succeeded them, looked upon the Eucharist as the Sacrifice of the New Law. Besides, this doctrine is not the teaching of the Church in any one country nor of some particular Doctor, but the teaching and practice of the Church Universal. The Church received it from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ.

"This is what St. Irenaeus teaches us; what St. Ignatius and St. Justin taught us before him; what Tertullian and Cyprian taught after him.... Since many Protestant doctors have known the true teaching of the Apostolic Church on this matter, and the error of Luther and Calvin, O would that all could agree to the resolution of restoring to the Divine Majesty this supreme honour, which is His due".[15]

THOMAS MULDOON.

---

[15]Annotationes in Irenaeum, 4, 17;

Moral Theology & Canon Law

KNITTING ON SUNDAYS

Dear Rev. Sir,

Would you kindly give us some light on the question of servile works on Sunday?

It seems to be the practice amongst what one would call good Catholics to knit on Sundays—as a past-time—in between sets of tennis. Do you think this is lawful or to be tolerated?

Some say that the use of fancy designs in knitting, e.g., in jumpers, etc., is a work of art, and, consequently, would come under the same title as embroidery. Others say that fancy sewing, i.e., working with coloured threads on designs already drawn, as in fancy tablecloths, would be allowed.

I am aware that this has been dealt with in your paper some years ago, but I think a review of liberal works would be very helpful.

WESTERN PRIEST.

REPLY.

In recent years the law of Sunday observance, insofar as it forbids servile works, has been the subject of some developments of theological thought. Knitting is one of those occupations in regard to which there have been marked digressions from the traditional teaching. Against the weight of authority many modern moralists permit knitting on days of precept, at least under certain conditions. Some continue to maintain that knitting is servile work, within the meaning of the canon, but seek to establish excusing causes or reasons for granting a dispensation (in accordance with Canon 1245). Others defend the thesis that, at least in certain localities, as a recreation or as an accomplishment, knitting is not to be reckoned as servile work, and, therefore, is not prohibited on days of precept. In the following exposition, this latter view is adopted in reference to the circumstances generally verified in Australia and New Zealand. If this doctrine is accepted, the problem concerning knitting on Sundays is settled in a satisfactory manner, as there is no need to weigh the factors which would constitute excusing causes or reasons for granting a dispensation.

SERVILE WORK.

As the subject of servile work in general has been treated at length in previous issues of this periodical, the basic principles will be set forth

briefly, preparatory to expounding the current opinions concerning the morality of knitting on days of precept.

The law of Sunday observance was introduced by way of custom. It was an intimate Christian conviction that the Lord's day should be sanctified by participating in public worship and by abstaining from certain occupations which were opposed to the proper sanctification of the Sabbath—amongst them servile works. In due course this custom was incorporated in the decrees of various Councils. The general law of the Church is expressed in Canon 1248:

> "On days of precept Mass must be heard, and one must abstain from servile work and from judical proceedings; also, unless legitimate custom or special indults make an exception, from markets, fairs, and other public buying and selling".

No definition of servile work is offered in the law, so that its meaning must be sought in the commentaries of approved authors. Following the explanation of St. Thomas, authors describe servile work as that which is done principally by bodily labour with a view to some corporal utility; it is the kind of work formerly done by slaves. Liberal work, on the contrary, is that which is performed principally by mental effort and is ordained to the development of the mind; it is the kind of work considered proper to free men in the past. In view of this basic distinction, it may be expected that the common estimation of what is servile work will change somewhat with changes in the social order. In modern conditions an employer of labour may be quite prepared to engage in bodily labour, while a wage-earning labourer has open to him many opportunities of a liberal education.

In determining what work is to be accounted servile we are to take into account the nature of the work itself (*finis operis*), not extrinsic considerations, such as the motive of the one engaged in the work (*finis operantis*), e.g., profit, the degree of fatigue experienced by him, the element of recreation, which laborious work may afford one whose regular occupation is liberal in character. Applying these principles, authors generally have included knitting amongst servile works, which are prohibited on days of precept.

KNITTING—EXCUSING CAUSES AND DISPENSATIONS.

Some authors, while retaining the traditional view that knitting is servile work, easily admit an excusing cause or a sufficient reason for dispensation. The latter may be granted by Ordinaries or parish priests, in individual cases, for the benefit of individual members of the faithful

or individual families. (Canon 1245, 1.) In other cases a confessor, who has not the power of dispensing, may declare that a suitable excusing cause is verified. In either case, the law would remain, forbidding knitting on Sundays as servile work, but individual subjects would be freed from its observance. (See *A.C.R.*, Issue of July, 1940.)

The reasons admitted as sufficient are to avoid idleness, to indulge in lawful recreation, etc. Some authors who support this view indicate restrictive conditions, e.g., the knitting must not be carried on for too long, it must not be done for gain, scandal must be avoided, etc.

CUSTOM AS INTERPRETER OF LAW CONCERNING SERVILE WORK.

In determining what works were to be considered servile, custom and common acceptation were the determining factors in the beginning. Those occupations were excluded which appeared to be more opposed to the objective of sanctifying the Sunday. It would appear reasonable that in determining whether a doubtful occupation is prohibited as servile, due deference should be paid to sound Christian judgment of a particular locality that the occupation in question is opposed to the purpose of the precept or not. Indirectly, the extrinsic factors referred to above—the profit motive, recreation, avoidance of idleness, etc.—may be decisive, insofar as the common estimation of a particular occupation has been formed on the basis of these considerations.

Applying this principle, it would be concluded that knitting, not as an ordinary, everyday occupation, but as a feminine accomplishment and a recreation, generally speaking, is not to be accounted as servile under the conditions obtaining in Australia and New Zealand. It is assumed that the knitting is not being done for profit, but for personal use, for a charitable cause, or to provide a gift for another. This common estimation would be influenced by the fact that there is a degree of artistry in much of the modern knitting, which was not usual in former times. In general, modern knitting is more on a par with fancy embroidery, which has been accounted as liberal in the traditional view. This does not mean that some element of fancy or complicated knitting must be verified each time.

If this line of reasoning is accepted, most cases will be solved easily on the basis that knitting as a pastime is not servile work. Some cases of doubt will remain, e.g., if the knitting is a recreative occupation, but also, is being done for profit. Such cases will need to be examined to

determine whether there is an excusing cause, or, at least, just cause for a dispensation.

Our correspondent's question regarding fancywork—"working with coloured threads on a design already drawn, as in fancy tablecloths"—should be answered in similar terms to the query concerning knitting. If there is some doubt that this work comes within the traditional classification of what is liberal, it may be taken for granted that custom and common estimation place it in the same category as knitting in our local conditions.

* * * *

APPLICATION OF MASS: WHICH INTENTION IS VALID?

Dear Rev. Sir,

Mrs. X. recently asked me to say two Masses; one for her deceased father, the other for her deceased mother; giving the customary stipend for *each* Mass. I said the Mass for the deceased father, but, forgetting I had done so, I again offered Mass for same intention some days later. Had I adverted to previous Mass at the time, I should have offered the second Mass for the second intention not yet fulfilled. Does this *actual* intention of second Mass hold, thus obliging me to a further Mass for the deceased mother, or is that actual intention revoked by my habitual *virtual* intention of saying second Mass for second intention of donor.

PERPLEXED.

REPLY.

It is not clear whether our correspondent had actually elicited an intention to say "a second Mass for the second intention of the donor." For he speaks of his "habitual, virtual" intention of doing so, but his expression, "had I adverted to the previous Mass at the time," would suggest that he had a general purpose of discharging his obligations, without having elicited an intention to fulfil this particular intention on a particular day. Two replies are submitted with a view to meeting both contingencies.

1. We may suppose that Father Perplexed formed an intention of offering Mass for the deceased mother (second intention) on a certain day. Forgetting his intention, or forgetting that his intention was to offer Mass for the deceased mother, and not the deceased father, he elicited an intention of offering Mass for the deceased father (first intention). The question will be, which intention is predominant? The answer is that that intention is considered predominant which he would have made, had he remembered the one previously elicited for that day.

Therefore, his second Mass will be considered as having been offered for the second intention, and his obligations in regard to the whole affair will have been satisfied. (Noldin III, N. 181.)

2. The explanation given in the query suggests that no definite intention had been elicited to offer the second Mass for the second intention. There was, of course, a general purpose of discharging those obligations not yet fulfilled, and, naturally, apart from a lapse of memory, there was no question of offering Mass for an intention already fulfilled. If a priest were to advert to the fact that already he had offered Mass for intention X and not yet for intention Y, he would not apply Mass for intention X, but for intention Y. But there would be only an interpretative intention of offering Mass for intention Y—which is styled an intention only analogously. It is the intention which he *would have* elicited, *had* he adverted to the situation; actually he did not elicit it at all. Therefore, his obligation to apply Mass for intention Y is not yet fulfilled; he must apply another Mass for that intention.

It would appear that this was the situation verified in the case of our correspondent. "I said Mass for the deceased father, but forgetting I had done so, I again offered Mass for the same intention some days later. Had I adverted to the previous Mass at the time, I should have offered the second Mass for the second intention not yet fulfilled".

* * * *

VALIDITY OF BIGAMIST'S MARRIAGE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A Catholic girl was duped into marrying bigamously a non-Catholic who later on went through a third form of marriage when she had found out the truth and left him. She obtained a civil decree of nullity. However, when the parochus was making inquiries about the status of the man it came out that he had been baptised a Catholic, but probably never brought up to know the fact. Several complications arise concerning the second marriage which I would like you to elucidate.

Firstly, if he had been baptised but never brought up as a Catholic, would the first marriage be valid since it was contracted with a non-Catholic?

Secondly, if he had been brought up a Catholic to some extent, what is the position? The first marriage would have been invalid, but what of the second? I maintain that, since he considered himself validly married on the first occasion, and intented to commit bigamy on

both the second and third occasions, he had no intention of contracting matrimony, and, therefore, the second marriage was null.

E.R.

REPLY.

It will be assumed that the bigamist's first marriage—with a non-Catholic—was performed in a non-Catholic church, or before a civil registrar, whereas his second marriage—with the Catholic girl—was performed with observance of the canonical form.

VALIDITY OF FIRST MARRIAGE.

The canon which determines who are bound by the canonical form of marriage was amended, as from January 1st, 1949, by the rescission of the well-known comma of Canon 1099, 2, beginning with the words "ab acatholicis nati." Therefore, the queries concerning the first marriage may call for different replies according as the marriage was performed before or after that date. (Vide *A.C. Record,* Issue of January, 1949.) The position may be summarised, briefly, as follows:

Prior to January 1st, 1949, not all those who had been baptised in the Catholic Church were bound to observe the canonical form of marriage. Besides non-Catholics generally, those also were exempt from this law who were described as "ab acatholicis nati, etsi in Ecclesia catholica baptizati, qui ab infantili aetate in haeresi vel schismate aut infidelitate vel sine ulla religione adoleverunt, quoties cum parte acatholica contraxerint".

As a result of successive authentic interpretations issued by the Code Commission, the words "ab acatholicis nati" were seen to include all those, at the time of whose birth, at least one parent was a non-Catholic, i.e., a heretic, schismatic, apostate, or member of an atheistic sect.

A regular difficulty is to determine what degree of Catholic upbringing after the canonical age of infancy will suffice to have a person classified as "brought up in the Catholic religion" rather than as "brought up in heresy or schism or infidelity or without any religion." There are many borderline cases, which present considerable difficulty to ecclesiastical judges, who are required to pronounce upon the validity of a marriage contracted outside the Church by such persons. It was in consideration of such difficulties that the Holy See decided upon the rescission of this comma. The well-known American canonist and judge of the Sacred Roman Rota, Monsignor Doheny, offers this practical rule for determining what constitutes Catholic status:

"Any identification with the Church in its sacraments, its religious functions, and its religious life, whether this identification be formal or voluntary, is viewed as sufficient. But there must be some identification between the Catholic Church and the person, so that the person has at one time or another actually participated in the life of the Church as a Catholic, and not merely as a visitor or as a dilettante". (Doheny, Canonical Procedure in Matrimonial Cases, Vol. 1, p. 671.)

Therefore, if the wedding took place before January 1st, 1949, and if it is established that the man in question was baptised in the Catholic Church, the first investigation will be to ascertain the religion of his parents at the time of his birth. If both parents were Catholic, he was bound by the law of canonical form and his (first) marriage, contracted outside the Church, was null. If, however, it is found that at least one parent was a heretic, schismatic, apostate, or member of an atheistic sect at the time of his birth, a further investigation will be required to ascertain whether he grew up from infancy in heresy, or schism, or infidelity, or without any religion. If the reply is in the affirmative, then he is not bound by the law of canonical form, so that his (first) marriage was valid.

If the marriage took place on or after January 1st, 1949, the fact of his having been baptised in the Catholic Church would make him a subject of the law requiring marriage to be contracted in the presence of an authorised priest and two witnesses. Therefore, his first marriage would be accounted as invalid.

VALIDITY OF SECOND MARRIAGE.

Our correspondent maintains that the second marriage of a conscious bigamist must be invalid from defect of an intention to marry, regardless of the validity or invalidity of the previous bond. This contention cannot be maintained. The bigamist may have vitiated his consent by reason of his belief that the second marriage cannot be valid. But this is not a necessary consequence. Canon 1084 enuntiates the relevant principle—knowledge or opinion that a marriage is invalid does not necessarily exclude matrimonial consent. Knowledge or opinion is in the intellect; it may vitiate the act of the will, which constitutes consent, or it may leave it naturally valid.

It may happen that the bigamist, as a result of his opinion that the second marriage cannot be a true marriage, will simulate matrimonial consent, so that the words, "I will, etc." are really empty forms. In that case he has qualified his consent in accordance with his opinion

of nullity. From its very nature his consent is insufficient to make a marriage, so that, even if no diriment impediment is present, there is no marriage. On the other hand, it may happen that, while knowing that his consent is ineffective juridically, he places an act of the will in the sense of real matrimonial consent. In that case he has not qualified his consent in accordance with his opinion as to the validity of the union. Therefore, his consent will be effective naturally, regardless of whether the impediment of previous bond renders the marriage invalid.

A parallel case is that of a Catholic who goes through the form of marriage before a civil registrar, knowing that the union will be invalid, but giving a naturally valid, matrimonial consent. It is on the assumption that such consent has been given that a sanatio in radice may be granted to such a person.

It will be for an ecclesiastical court to give a decision upon the validity or nullity of the bigamist's second marriage by applying the foregoing principles.

* * * *

COMBINED RELIGIOUS SERVICE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

What do you think of Catholics taking part in a Combined Religious Service, such as is organised in some places on Anzac Day? Is it forbidden by the law which prohibits communicatio in sacris?

RUSTICUS.

REPLY.

With a view to offering a reply to the foregoing query, the canonical principles concerning active and passive communicatio in sacris will be recapitulated in brief.

Active Communicatio in Sacris.

Canon 1258, 1: It is illicit (haud licitum) for the faithful in any way to assist at or take part in the sacred worship of non-Catholics.

They communicate actively in the rites of non-Catholics who take part in the non-Catholic act of cult. This is forbidden absolutely in the canon cited above, as it is intrinsically wrong. True, it may well fall short of apostasy or heresy, which involves an internal, deliberate approbation of the cult and the doctrines of which it is an expression. Nevertheless, it implies an external approval of the cult and, by implication, a denial of the true religion.

Therefore, active participation in non-Catholic worship is forbidden

simply, regardless of the differing circumstances of possible scandal and danger of perversion.

Passive Communicatio in Sacris.

Canon 1258, 2—Passive or merely material presence, on account of a civil office or for the purpose of showing respect to a person, for a grave reason which should be approved by the Ordinary in a case of doubt, may be tolerated, at funerals, weddings and other such celebrations of non-Catholics, provided that there is no danger of perversion or scandal.

Here there is question of merely bodily presence at non-Catholic rites, in which no active part is taken. A person is present in the place of worship, but is not a member of the congregation in that he is not a party to the corporate act of worship which is being performed. Such acts as those of rising and sitting with the congregation do not necessarily constitute active participation; they may be carried out simply from considerations of politeness.

Such presence at non-Catholic worship is not forbidden outright, since it is not intrinsically evil. It is tolerated in certain circumstances and when certain safeguards are employed. Here is an application of the rule of the double effect. The evil effects which may follow are the perversion of the Catholic party assisting passively at the function and the possible scandal for others, Catholic and non-Catholic alike. In individual cases it will need to be concluded, reasonably, that these dangers are not present (dummodo, etc.) and that the person who is present has a proportionately grave cause, in case of doubt, to be approved by the Ordinary. Furthermore, the terms of the canon restrict the tolerance to certain cases—funerals, marriages, and similar ceremonies.

It should be emphasised that in making a decision in individual cases, the possibility of scandal should be scrutinised with care. It will be necessary to weigh carefully the varying conditions of persons and places.

Combined Religious Services.

It is not unusual for non-Catholic bodies to promote combined religious services on the occasion of a war anniversary or of some commemoration for those who have fallen. However great may be our desire to oblige non-Catholics by co-operating with them on such occasions, it would appear to be forbidden by the law of Canon 1258. Moreover, there is grave reason to doubt the supposed benefits of such co-operation.

Participation in a combined religious service would seem to con-

stitute active communicatio in sacris, forbidden by Canon 1258, 1. It is an active participation in worship which is not the worship of the Catholic Church, performed by her accredited ministers. It will be argued that, as no particular religious body takes the lead, it is not the act of worship of any religious body, especially when the prayers are read by a layman who is not the official representative of any church. But, a corporate, public act of worship presupposes a common religious faith and conviction on the part of those who participate. In taking part in a service, in which the various participants share certain fundamental beliefs and differ in many essential doctrines, we would seem to give tacit approval to the teaching of indifferentism that one form of Christianity is as true and as good and, objectively, as pleasing to God, as another.

Apart from this consideration of the intrinsic right and wrong of taking part in a combined service, the element of scandal must be taken into account always, insofar as both Catholics and non-Catholics are encouraged in an attitude of religious indifferentism.

Various documents issued by the Holy See promote a wise policy of collaboration with non-Catholic bodies in the field of natural law, particularly in regard to its implications in the social field; collaboration in the field of religious worship or by way of seeking agreement in a minimum of revealed truth is not encouraged in the same way. The desirable objective is stated admirably in one of the documents bearing on this subject and issued in England during the war as "parallel action in the religious and joint action in the social and international field".

* * * *

ECCLESIASTICAL BURIAL OF CARELESS CATHOLIC.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Bertha, born, baptized and reared as a Catholic, ceases to practise her religion when thirty years of age and from then until her death, forty years later, she never enters a church door. She has been frequently reminded of her religious duties and obligations by the local priest. Though these reminders were in vain, Bertha could not be described as antagonistic towards the Church. Owing to her sudden death, however, Bertha did not get an opportunity of either refusing or availing of the last Sacraments. May she be described as a "notorious apostate from the Christian faith" (Can. 1240, 1, 6°), or as a "public and manifest sinner" (Can. 1240, 1, 6°), to the effect of being refused ecclesiastical burial?

TITIUS.

REPLY.

Ecclesiastical burial implies that the deceased was a son of the Church, whose public solemnities and suffrages he shares in death, just as he participated in her spiritual treasures during life. Logically, therefore, ecclesiastical burial is not accorded to unbaptized, who were never sons of the Church. Likewise, it is denied to those baptized persons who deliberately cut themselves off from the Church in life, by their public unworthiness. Those who should incur this penalty of deprival of ecclesiastical burial are enumerated in Canon 240 of the Code. Five classes of persons are designated—less specifically the sixth group includes—Other public and manifest sinners.

It may be stated definitely that Bertha, of the case, is not to be deprived of ecclesiastical burial by reason of her entering the first class. She cannot be classed as a "notorious apostate from the Christian faith". An apostate is one who, having received Baptism, has completely abandoned the Christian faith (Can. 1325, 2). Those who abandon the faith and publicly profess to be atheists, rationalists, free thinkers, fall within this category. It is not enough that a person has abandoned the practice of religion, even in the face of repeated reminders.

Generally speaking, and apart from some particular element of scandal being verified, such a persons should not be denied ecclesiastical burial as a "public and manifest sinner". The Code does not specify which sins, if public and manifest, merit this penalty. However, reference to pre-Code Commentators and a comparison with the crimes listed in the preceding paragraphs of this canon bear out the opinion that this is not of sufficient gravity as an external violation of law to be a case contemplated by the law. If the complete abandonment of religious practice were accompanied by an open and public hostility to the Church, her works, her ministers, her authority, it could be a case for refusal of ecclesiastical burial. But our correspondent states explicitly that she was not antagonistic to the Church.

JAMES CARROLL.

Liturgy

NOTES CONCERNING THE CHURCH AND ITS FURNISHINGS. VI.

1.—*The Holy Oils Ambry.*

The Code of Canon Law (Can. 735) prescribes the Holy Oils to be kept in the Church, unless for some reasonable cause the Ordinary permits the priest to keep the Oils in a safe and becoming place at home. Mere convenience is not considered by *S.C.R.* (D.D. 2650, 3276, 3739, 3779) as a valid reason for keeping the Holy Oils at the Priest's home, even though the parochial residence does not adjoin the Church. The Fourth Plenary Council (D. 320) reiterates the prescription of Canon Law.

No specific location is determined by the Rubrics as to where the Holy Oils should be found; rubricians favour any of the following places —1. In the body of the Church. 2. In the sacristy. 3. The Baptistery. 4. The Sanctuary. Most authorities incline to the sanctuary, preferably on the Gospel side; others favour the sacristy in preference to the body of the church or the baptistery.

The ambry containing the oil-stocks should be hung on or built into the wall, and be furnished with a lock and key. On the door the words —"Olea sacra" should be inscribed. A veil may hang in front of the door; if the Oil of the Sick alone is to be found there, the veil will be violet; otherwise, a veil of white and violet will be used where all three Oils are located.

2.—*The Baptistery.*

According to Canon 774 a Baptismal Font is to be erected in every Parish Church. The Baptistery in which the Font is located should be separated from the remainder of the Church, either as a special chapel or by a railing or screen. The entrance to the baptistery should be fitted with a lock and key. Ordinarily the baptistery ought to be found on the Gospel side. A picture or representation of the Baptism of Christ ought to be erected in the baptistery.

The font itself should be solid marble, stone, or metal; no particular design is prescribed. The font usually consists of two parts—one half containing the baptismal water, and the other used to receive the water at the actual baptism; this is connected to the sacrarium by a metal tube. The font should be covered with a lid, which may be attached to the font by a hinge or pivot; the use of pulleys may also be employed.

Like the entrance to the baptistery, the cover ought to be fitted with a lock and key.

Besides the font, the baptistery should be equipped with the following articles—Holy Oils of Chrism and Catechumens; salt (once blessed it may be used for every occasion); wax candle; towels; white linen veil (to represent the white garment worn by the newly-baptized); white and violet stoles (may be reversible); cotton wool; a Ritual.

The oily substance which forms on the water may conveniently and reverently be removed with cotton wool.

Since the Baptistery is considered the most important part of the church after the High Altar, it should receive due care in cleanliness.

3.—*The Confessional.*

Canon Law (Can. 909) and Decrees 402, 403 of the Plenary Council draw attention to the fact that the Confessional should be located in an open and conspicuous part of the church, and that a grille should be inserted in the dividing partition beween the Confessor's and the Penitent's compartment. Usually the Confessional will be so constructed as to provide for a Penitent's compartment on each side of the Priest's. Violet curtains may be hung over the grille.

No particular prescriptions are set forth for the design or material to be used in the construction of the Confessional; it is most important to ensure that the Confessional is sound-proof, and that ample opportunity for fresh air is also afforded.

The Confessor's compartment should be furnished with a seat having arm-rests; on the wall may hang a picture of Our Lord or Our Lady, and the list of reserved sins appended to the door. A light ought to be placed outside to indicate that the Priest is in the Confessional. A comfortable kneeler with arm-rests ought to be set up in the Penitent's compartment. A crucifix should be placed in a conspicuous position. In some Confessionals there is a light showing outside whenever a penitent is in Confession.

4.—*The Stations of the Cross.*

Normally the Stations of the Cross may be erected only by Cardinals, Bishops and Major and Local Superiors of the Friars Minor. However, the Formula Maior granted to the Bishops of Australia permits this faculty to be delegated to priests designated by the Local Ordinary. Provided the necessary faculty to erect the Stations is given, and the Formula as contained in the Roman Ritual is observed, the Stations are valid. It is not necessary to have pictures or images

of the various Stations; all that is necessary is to have fourteen wooden crosses. Where the use of images or pictures is employed, the crosses may be attached to columns or the wall, and either the whole way round the church or portion of it.

No special side has been prescribed for the Stations to commence on, and consequently they may begin on the epistle or gospel side. The only thing to keep in mind is to so arrange them as to have the persons performing the Stations following Our Lord around the church instead of meeting Him in the opposite direction.

Once the Stations are canonically erected it is not necessary to "revalidate" them except in the following cases—

1. If the Crosses are permanently removed.
2. If all the crosses or the majority of them are renewed.

If, therefore, the pictures or images are entirely changed or renovated, or if the Crosses are temporarily removed, no re-erection is required. The same holds good if the crosses are renewed, provided the majority of the original crosses remain; likewise, if the position of the crosses is changed within the one building, it is not required to re-erect them.

R. F. DONOHOE.

* * * *

QUERIES.

COLOUR OF THE TABERNACLE VEIL—SERVER CHANGING THE CHALICE VEIL AFTER THE ABLUTIONS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A reply to the following questions would be appreciated:—

1. On those days on which the rubrics allow me to say a Requiem Mass, the Sister Sacristan usually sets the black vestments as well as those for the Mass of the day. She asks me whether she should change the Tabernacle veil, if it is not already violet, when she sees that I am going to say a Requiem Mass?

2. In a recent discussion, one of my confreres stated that it is not correct for the altar server to change the chalice veil to the Gospel side of the altar after the ablutions. Is that so?

CAPPELLANUS.

REPLY.

1. The Sacred Congregation of Rites has issued a number of decrees concerning the colour of the tabernacle veil. A white veil may be used at all times, however, it is preferable that the veil should be the

same colour as the altar frontal, which varies according to the colour of the Office of the day (3035, 10). If the Blessed Sacrament is exposed on the altar the tabernacle should be covered with a white veil (1615, 7-9; 2673). When the exposition or deposition of the Blessed Sacrament takes place immediately before or after Mass or Office, and the Celebrant and Ministers do not leave the altar, then the colour of the veil may be the colour of the Office of the day (3559). For All Souls' Day and Solemn Requiem Masses a violet veil is used (3562). Violet would be the correct colour of the veil at a Funeral Mass, but for a private Requiem Mass, as for a private Votive Mass, the veil corresponding to the colour of the Office of the day should remain.

2. The rubrics of the Missal make no mention of the server changing the chalice veil. They simply state that, after the Celebrant has purified the chalice, the server carries the Missal to the epistle side of the altar and places it there as for the Introit (*Ritus servandus* xi, i). Commentators on the rubrics add nothing to the directions of the rubrics. O'Connell in a footnote remarks: 'The server should not move the chalice veil' (*The Celebration of Mass,* vol. ii, p. 208). Obviously there is no need for the server to change the position of the veil as it is already at hand for the Celebrant when he needs it. Nevertheless, the practice could no doubt be justified by custom in this country.

* * * *

PLENARY INDULGENCES FOR PRAYER TO CHRIST THE KING AND FOR THE HEROIC ACT.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Would you kindly reply in the *A.C.R.* to the following queries:—

1. To gain the Plenary Indulgence for the prayer to Christ the King (No. 254, Raccolta, 1944) is the "visit" condition fulfilled by attendance at the Mass, even if of obligation, at which one receives Holy Communion?

2. Two other Plenary Indulgences may be gained under the usual conditions (No. 547) by those who make the "heroic act"—one after Holy Communion and the other when they offer Mass on Monday in honour of the Holy Souls. Must a special "visit" be made for each of these two Indulgences?

RELIGIOSUS.

REPLY.

1. 'A plenary indulgence on the usual conditions once daily' is attached to the prayer to Christ the King. What is the meaning of the

phrase 'on the usual conditions'? In the Preface of the Raccolta, No. 4 (New York, 1944) we read: 'The conditions ordinarily prescribed for gaining the plenary indulgences contained in this Collection and designated by the familiar phrase "under the usual conditions" are the following: confession, Communion, a visit to a church or public oratory, or even a semi-public oratory (in the case of those who may lawfully use the latter according to Canon 929), and prayer for the intentions of the Supreme Pontiff. In cases, however, where all the aforesaid conditions are not required, those which are necessary are separately mentioned in the proper places'. Among the moralists, Davis affirms that ' it may be taken as practically certain that, for plenary indulgences, the expression "usual conditions" means confession, Holy Communion, a visit to a church or public oratory, and prayers for the Pope's intentions' (*Moral and Pastoral Theology,* 3rd edit., vol. iii, p. 432), although he also observes that 'the condition of a visit to a church is fulfilled by receiving Holy Communion in a church' (*ibid*). Genicot likewise states that ' "consuetae condiciones" comprehendunt visitationem ecclesiae' (*Theol. moral,* edit. 15a, vol. ii, n. 405, nota 2). On the other hand, Cappello maintains that by the phrase 'under the usual conditions' is to be understood, besides the state of grace and at least an implicit habitual intention, confession, Communion, and prayers for the Pope's intentions (*De sacramentis,* edit. 4a, vol. ii, n. 657). The same opinion is held by Noldin-Schmitt (*Summa Theol. moral.,* edit. 24a, vol. iii, n. 325, 3), Aertnys-Damen (*Theol. moral.,* edit. 13a, t. ii, n. 1123), Merkelbach (*Summa Theol.* moral., edit. 4a, t. iii, n. 680, 1). According to these authors, then, the visit to a church is not necessary, unless explicitly prescribed. In practice it seems that their opinion can be quite safely followed. Hence, confession, Communion, and prayer for the Pope's intention suffice for the gaining of the Plenary Indulgence attached to the recitation of the prayer to Christ the King.

2. As to the indulgences to be gained by those who make the heroic act, the Raccolta (No. 547) says: 'A plenary indulgence, applicable only to the dead;

i. on any day that they receive Holy Communion, if they have made their confession and visited some church or public oratory to pray for the intention of the Supreme Pontiff;

ii. on any Monday of the year, if they hear Mass in honor of the Holy Souls and fulfill the usual conditions'.

It is presumed that 'Religious' is one of those 'who are accustomed,

unless lawfully hindered, to approach the sacrament of penance at least twice a month, or to receive Holy Communion in the state of grace and with a right and devout intention daily, although they may abstain from it once or twice during the week', and who, consequently, 'can gain all indulgences, even without the actual confession which would otherwise be necessary for gaining them', exception made for certain jubilee indulgences (Canon 931, § 3). Canon 933 lays down that 'by one and the same work, to which by different titles various indulgences are attached, one cannot gain these several indulgences, unless the required work be confession or Communion, or unless the contrary be explicitly stated'. In application to the case in question, it may be said that a person who wishes to gain both the above indulgences on any one Monday may gain the second indulgence by hearing Mass in honour of the Holy Souls, receiving Holy Communion, and praying for the Pope's intention. To gain the first Plenary Indulgence the same person must repeat the prayer for the Pope's intention and visit a church or oratory, which condition could be satisfied during the time of preparation or thanksgiving before or after hearing the Mass in the church or oratory.

P. MURPHY.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

STUDIES IN AUSTRALIAN SOCIAL PROBLEMS. Published by the Catholic Education Office, Melbourne and A.N.S.C.A., 1950. pp. 127, 2/-.

Effective social action can only follow from soundly informed minds. That truth, an expression of the principle that the will follows the intellect, surely accounts for the appearance of the booklet under review.

The basis of these Studies is the group of annual Social Justice Statements made by the Australian Hierarchy between 1941-1949. The author—a member of A.N.S.C.A.—has given a very attractive turn to his presentation by writing each of his chapters in terms of the practical application of each topic under present conditions. For this purpose the content of the various statements has been carefully categorized and each section supported with latest statistics and a useful list of relevant literature. As a result the author has made available a most commendable manual for high school and discussion group purposes. Perhaps the only defect is the absence of suggested exercises in thinking and initiative—always the sound test of profitable reading.

Provided it has the support of "enthusiastic teachers and lecturers," this stimulating compendium—it is really that—can do much in effecting the transition from Christian Social Thought to Christian Social Action in Australia.

N.T.

Homiletics

LENT.

Now therefore saith the Lord: "Be converted to Me with your whole heart in fasting, in weeping, and in mourning." Joel II, 12.

Always in the Church has the time before Easter been observed as a season of fasting and penance. The duration of the penitential period came to be fixed at forty days in memory of the forty days' fast of Our Divine Lord. The remembrance of the ordeal that Our Saviour, the Sinless One, voluntarily endured in the desert is indeed the most powerful incentive for us sinful sluggards to imitate, albeit imperfectly, His heroic example.

The necessity of penance is insisted upon in the strongest terms on almost every page of Holy Writ. We are a fallen race, and since the first disaster our history has been a catalogue of sins. Only penance can erase the sentence of condemnation our own crimes have written against us. True, Our Lord has taken our debts upon Himself and by His atoning death has won our Redemption. But Salvation is not an automatic process. There are certain conditions which we must fulfil if we would benefit by the satisfaction performed by Our Lord. Faith in Him and in His Church is necessary: requisite, too, is the use of the Sacraments He instituted as the channels of His grace. But neither Faith nor the Sacraments will avail to Salvation unless there be also a sincere turning-away from sin and a return-of-heart to God, unless, that is, there be Repentance. Contrition for past offences, and a purpose of amendment for the future—these are the essential elements of repentance: internal penance, as this is called, is most obviously necessary. Who pretending to serve God and to rejoice in the fellowship of Christ could be still unconvinced that he must give up and turn away from sin? But satisfaction or external penance, the doing of positive works of expiation, is also necessary. Not all sufficiently realize this truth. After all, some will argue, "I am sorry for my sins, I have confessed them and they have been forgiven. Christ's merits are more than sufficient to cancel my debts. Surely, then, if I avoid sin for the future, I can safely forget the lapses of the past". Precisely because it is easy and comfortable to reason thus, the Church, a solicitous mother, has not left the doing of penance to our own caprice. By strict law she compels us to perform a certain minimum of penance during the time of Lent, and

constantly exhorts us to supplement this minimum by further voluntary works of expiation.

How is it that a sinner having been absolved of his sin is still required to do penance for it? Grave sin involves a two-fold guilt. When a man knowingly and deliberately breaks the law of God in a serious matter, defying the threat of eternal punishment, he chooses some other thing as his supreme good in place of God. That thing he will have even if he loses God to get it. He turns from God to a creature: he dethrones the Almighty and worships an idol. Should death find him in that state of mind his choice remains fixed for eternity. He has choosed to separate himself from God—he will remain so separated forever. Repentance and forgiveness necessarily cancels out this awful eternal punishment. God has taken him back: he can no longer be cast out into the outer darkness.

But there was a second malice to his sin: it involved the abuse of one of God's creatures. God made that thing whatever it was, and made it for His glory and for man's spiritual profit. The sinner used it to insult its creator and to his own spiritual injury. This misappropriation of God's property demands compensation. Justice—and God is infinite justice—insists that unlawful enjoyment be expiated by otherwise unnecessary pain. This debt to divine justice is not always completely liquidated when the guilt of sin is taken away in Confession. Our Lord pays off for us the great bulk of our indebtedness but He insists that we ourselves make at least a token payment. That we may demonstrate the reality of our conversion, and that we may be deterred from future sinning, we are left with some of our debt still on our hands. This we may pay off in this life or in the next.

We may, if we foolishly ignore the warning of Our Lord, defer our expiation until Purgatory. From that dread prison we shall not go out until we have paid the last farthing. But if we are wise, we come to an arrangement with our creditor before we are taken to judgment. In this life God's mercy outshines His justice and a little effort has a very great value in His sight. Brief endurable mortification here accomplishes more than aeons of incredible suffering hereafter. What wonder that Holy Mother Church urges and compels us to do penance.

There is another reason, too, for Lent and its discipline of self-denial. The athlete preparing for the contest refrains from normal pleasures and harmless gratifications to harden his body, reinforce his stamina and quicken his reactions. In the spiritual life we enter the

lists with a wily and tireless opponent: if we are to resist his strength and defeat his tactics we must be trained to perfection. By practising self-denial in harmless things we strengthen and train ourselves for the time of temptation.

Lent, then, is an opportunity to be eagerly embraced rather than an ordeal to be grudgingly endured. It is shortsighted to seek unnecessary dispensations, it is foolish to excuse ourselves easily from the minor inconveniences, the trifling discomfort that the Lenten regulations entail. We should seek rather to supplement the minimum penances enjoined by Church law by others suitable to our health and duties. We should refrain from worldly amusements which, though innocent, are out of harmony with the tenor of the penitential season. We should intensify our private prayers and devotions, realising that during Lent the flood-gates of grace are opened. We ought, above all, frequently assist at Holy Mass, uniting thus our cowardly and meagre expiation with the superabundant satisfactions of the Victim on the Cross.

W. H. BAKER.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

SEEK YE FIRST, by Cardinal Griffin. London, Sheed and Ward, 1949. 12/6. pp. 261.

A book which leaves one deeply moved in thanksgiving for the certainty and security of the divine truth of our Catholic faith, and for the irrefutable principles which follow from them. His Eminence, Cardinal Griffin, has expounded these principles in his sermons and speeches quoted in this book, with that clarity of thought and piercing simplicity of language indicative of genuine scholarship, and with the fearlessness and burning zeal of a Prince of the True Church.

"Seek Ye First" is a selection of Cardinal Griffin's sermons and addresses (from the years 1944-48) on the great problems of the day, arranged in eight main sections by Messrs. Sheed and Ward—The Catholic Faith, Catholic Morality, Family Life, State and Citizen, International Relations, Human Labour, Education, and Youth. Obviously these are also our major problems, and we welcome this forthright examination of them with supplementary Catholic solutions. Cardinal Griffin points a warning finger at many evils of modern politics and state usurpation of private rights with a strong warning against the evil consequences.

This book is thoroughly recommended. It is bound to instil in the reader a stronger yearning for the reign of justice and peace.

N.C.

Notes

THE CINEMA IS THE HIGHEST FORM OF ART.

That title, strange as it may seem, is not a joke. It is the title of a most solemn scholastic disputation broadcast recently on the B.B.C. from Lincoln's Inn, two very serious Friar Preachers being the chief disputants. Father Hilary Carpenter, Provincial of the English Dominicans, and defender of the thesis, was the moving spirit behind the broadcast. He has displayed a keen interest in the apostolate of the screen for some time, and it has been largely through his instrumentality that the Catholic film review, *Focus,* has come into being. Certainly, he could hardly have chosen a more startling way in which to show what importance he attaches to the film.

Father Carpenter rests his demonstration on the classical Thomistic conception of an art form. An art form is ranked by reason of its aptitude to reflect in its integrity the vision of the artist. The highest art form is that which "most readily and most effectively reflects truth and goodness, that is the infinite variety of being and reality; and it must reflect them in the most significant manner, that is to say in the manner that registers most effectively on the minds and emotions of all those who are brought within its range".

The cinema, by its perfect harmonization of light and sound, the two most expressive and significant of all materials, infinitely surpasses all other media in scope and power. No other medium is so plastic, nor so effective.

The principal objection to the thesis was that photography is not the highest form of art, and the cinema is merely photography designed solely to entertain. To this the ultimate reply was that the entertainment offered by the cinema was not necessarily merely sensuous, but could have a great measure of appeal to the mind, and carry the highest intuitions of truth and beauty.

Other objectors maintained that the art of the film director is merely showmanship, and that he is necessarily subservient to economic considerations, which strangle his artistic integrity. However, Father Carpenter had little difficulty in pointing out the full scope of the director's work, and in showing how arguments drawn from the present deplorable condition of the film industry fail to touch his position, which is concerned with the art form of the cinema as such.

Father Carpenter's original thesis, presented in so arresting a fashion, will probably prick many a conscience among those who have failed to appreciate the real value of the cinema, and the importance of encouraging interest among Catholics in the growing movement towards small film productions such as those of the Catholic Film Group. It is becoming much more practical of late for such groups to produce films of a high technical and artistic quality. The reading of the text of the disputation, which was published in the June issue of *Blackfriars* will, we hope, also acord to many a striking illustration of the unexpected results that may be anticipated from a frank assessment of many of the elements of modern culture in the light of a rigorous philosophy. Such an assessment, carried out with sympathy and integrity, is the only possible path out of the confusion which is rapidly destroying, even among educated Catholics, objective standards of judgment in cultural matters. Firm objective standards are the basis of all cultural progress.

JOHN BURNHEIM.

* * * *

YOUTH AND YOUTH MOVEMENTS

It is a commonplace to-day to proclaim that this is the age of Youth. Without doubt on the froth of popular journalism Youth is swept to a pedestal that dwarfs all other stages of life. In answer a cynic might well comment that it is the age of Youth as long as Middle Age does all the planning, the work and the cleaning-up. Youth can manage the rest. The Church in her mission of winning souls to Christ is ever on the chase, catching up with her volatile wayward children, adopting and modifying their ever changing fashions, adapting herself to the manners of the generation, turning passing enthusiasm into permanent gain, becoming all things to all men. Consequently when the accent is on Youth, while Communism shrewdly appeals to the energetic restlessness of the young with her slogans and leagues, and paganism cultivates the physical development and satisfactions of the body, most parishes assign a zealous, junior priest to the task of counteracting the prevailing sweep of the tide and Catholic Youth Bodies spring up like mushrooms after rain.

RESULTS—APPARENT AND REAL.

Apparent results are immediate, spectacular, dazzling. Oil has been struck in such volume that it might seem heresy to question whether the effusion is not sometimes mostly gas, needing careful examination

before valuation. However, no activity suffers from such critical examination, and we have had sufficient experience to draw useful conclusions. An illuminating story will well serve here to discriminate between the gold and the dross of Catholic manifestations. When the patron of a Youth Club, presiding at the annual banquet, assured the company that the five hundred present were sufficient proof of the vitality of the organisation, the nervous president asked the secretary for a few ideas on which to construct his reply. The first was dazzling, but off the record: "Tell the visitor how pleased members are to see him once a year at the dinner, since it is as often as two-thirds of these present ever see one another."

It would be worth while to make a scientific study of the fruits of our Youth Movements, and it would be helpful to the clergy to study the young mind, its wants and reactions, because most directors approach their task with enthusiasm and as much understanding as ordination, their own experience and the example of already existing associations provide. Let us touch on the "materia ex qua," of possible Youth Clubs.

MATERIA EX QUA

Our Catholic schools sent into the world their alumni equipped in varying measure with the Faith, ideals, enthusiasms, ambitions, a hearty desire to enjoy life and have the best of both worlds, a thirst for games, amusements, and, above all, novelty. All these appetites offer ready beginnings for an organiser. Let him but supply the opportunities for the satisfaction of these normal appetities and within a year he will hit the headlines with a numerous, socially successful club whose sporting prowess is a menace to local rivals.

It is all too easy because all too human.

But as nothing in man is truly natural unless it is also supernatural, a supernatural yardstick must be applied until we see whether results were obtained by emphasis on the first or second half of the qualities above enumerated.

Now if there is an overall weakness in our Catholic training, which may be inevitable, it may be that it is too thorough, too generous, to the extent that it develops the faculty of taking only too well, at the expense of the virtue of giving. They provide if necessary, schools, text-books, clothes, sporting equipment, entertainment, extra time to coach the ambitious or dull, spiritual counsel, anticipation of problems, protection against trials. What a list of selfless oblations our clergy and teachers

make to the children from the Kindergarten to the Leaving Certificate?

All of this the pupil accepts without question or further consideration. By birthright it is his to receive. What more natural then than he continues to be the recipient and the Church the purveyor even when school days are behind him. It looks as easy to the new club member as to the Director. Perhaps both may come to estimate it as sufficient justification for Holy Orders, to provide free the amenities of life, the organizing ability, the hard work. Of a certainty the absence from the Dues Lists of the major part of young Catholics earning good wages with family responsibilties points to the same conclusion.

This outlook of young people indicating an over-developed right of profit-sharing with the Church and an underdeveloped sense of responsibility and co-operation, is felt when Directors are planning the type of Youth Organization. He who wishes to build on practical Catholicity as a foundation and spiritual progress as the main objective with social and sporting amenities as accompanying features will find at once that his listeners will be fit though few. In public opinion his venture will be considered almost a failure and he himself will be disappointed that he is not reaching the ones he wants. On the other hand his colleague, offering unlimited amenities as a bait to make contacts and get careless lads to mass thereby will be swept off his feet with applications on which a sufficient commentary may be passed at the end of a victorious football season by a successful player: "Thank God the football season is over. A man can sleep in on a Sunday".

THE MINIMUM BONUM.

The difficulty in obtaining any contribution in work or sacrifice from our young Catholics is real and widespread, though with the select few the reverse is the case. In practice it seems to be easier to disband a big club and start all over again than it is to infuse spirituality into a mass whose foundations were material. But still it is a big temptation to appeal to the lowest common denominator in Catholic democracy and strive for the minimum bonum, a definite good is loose connection with Church, priest, and good companions from which will result a lessened danger of drift and bad marriages.

Consequently there is ground on both sides for the argument between the two schools of thought with this difference, however, that the minimum bonum party must forego any claim to participate in Catholic Action.

CATHOLIC ACTION AND THE AVERAGE MAN.

Unfortunately once the concept of Catholic Action enters a very large proportion of our Youth cease to be interested. They are the "untouchables". For the world has fastened its hold on them to the extent that they restrict their contact with the Church to the bare essentials for soul saving. They become quietly defiant to the appeal to give something extra or to give up the looser pleasures shared in common with others of the same age, irrespective of Faith, school, home. Though they are the ones most in need of guidance they are the least responsive to an offer of help. The obligation of attendance at Mass is accepted, shall we say, "in principle or in globo", with the proviso that not over much insistence must be made on absolute individual fulfilment. Monthly reception of the Sacraments is accepted in theory only. Beyond this it is hard to make further claim, even that there should be a nexus with the Holy Name Society or kindred church sodalities.

In return for the little they offer the claims are rather considable that are made on the Church. Once Mass is over the sanctity of the Sunday may be expressed in sport and picnics with Evening Devotions represented by a dance. Drink is to be an accepted thing even for those still under the pledge. In football the Club is to be allowed to earn the title of the roughest team in the competition with a procession of members off the field after conflict with the umpire. And to keep contact and control to some extent many a chaplain is placed in the invidious position of having to close one eye to such abuses and is forced to spend as little of the Sunday near the Church as can be decently managed.

Whether the profit and loss account of such a priest's time and energy works for or against ordination may sometimes well be doubted. So much is spent running away from the Church in the hope of bringing back stray youths to the Church at the expense of the various other avenues of pastoral activity.

However, in addition to the good that certainly comes from any work among youth we must consider the bigger dividends which accrue from the many Youth organizations working on a higher level. The idealistic side of Youth is also the product of Grace and Catholic teaching. It is truly on tap in great reserves of wealth and power in a virile minority and is a vein of gold not far from the surface in a considerable number of our lads and girls. This has produced many associations

catering for the best in the development of soul, character, mind and body, and put together their total is impressive.

Perhaps we may make a rough guess that about thirty per cent. of our Catholic young people will hearken to the voice of a Director who is prepared to work hard, resolutely turning his back on the spectacular and labouring to draw the best out of his charges in order that the progress will be in them and from them, rather than from him and in them like a parasitic growth. With this proportion of the ground well worked and the nerve centres of leadership appearing, Catholic Action is realizing itself in Youth and in Society while the Chaplains have no doubt of the apostolicity of their efforts.

SUMMING UP.

Youth is a rich field of activity both from the positive and negative aspects.

It is full of difficulties and complexities.

Even the minimum bonum is a gain though it is hardly Catholic Action..

Easiest results are obtained by superficial cultivation.

The scope and call of Catholic Action is without limits for a zealous Priest.

C. J. DUFFY.

* * * *

MAX JACOB

The empty, silent streets of Maurice Utrillo's paintings were the setting for the characters, and their theories, who have shaped so much of the world's art and literature since 1900. A quite respectable reputation and income can be won by anyone who knew Montmartre and its inhabitants during the first fourteen years of the century. They can see in the spaces of Utrillo's *Place du Tertre* what we cannot see—the shadows, slipping by, of Modigliani, erect like a young prince, of Max Jacob, his eye gleaming behind his monocle, of Picasso, of Braque, of Utrillo himself, and shadows, too, of sons of misery who perished during 1914-18, or fell unnoticed by the cruel world, victims of vice and misfortune. These were self-styled pioneers of the Modern Spirit; they began the *March of the Moderns*.[1] The young generation of painters needed men of letters to explain, or to mystify, the public with accounts of the theories and desires of the artists. That was the duty of Jacob and Apollinaire,

[1]William Gaunt's recent book, *The March of the Moderns* (London, 1949), is well known as a most informative and amusing account of the artists and writers who made up the Modern School.

and with their fantastic talents it was a task well fitted for them.[2] Max Jacob was a Jew born at Quimper in 1876.[3] His parents kept a modest second-hand shop, but the youthful Max left his home to live the life of an artist in Paris, in a gloomy room in *Rue Ravignan.* He was, as it has been well put, a universal amateur. He was an excellent painter, but picture dealers, after viewing his work, counselled him to write. He was, too, eccentric poet, born satirist and active dramatist. Publishers, after reading his amusing pages, however, usually ended up by advising him to stick to painting, as he was bound to be a 'confidential author,' beloved of by the few. The result was Max adopted Misery as his profession. He learnt how tight a belt must be pulled when you wander in cold streets without a *sou.* He learnt, too, the friendly cafés which welcomed artists and gave credit. The artists considered it was a cheap way for the proprietors to get their name associated with the men of the future! Max Jacob had immense wit and was a welcome guest at many tables, happily for Max. He would recite poems, do a whole play of Racine, taking all the parts with professional skill, his imitations of the dances of the Russian ballet were a furore in great and rich houses. Picasso declared Max was *the* poet; Max regarded the Spaniard as the greatest painter of them all. Many are the stories which Roland Dorgelès tells of Max Jacob in his book *Bouquet de Bohème* (Paris, 1947) and Francis Carco completes in his *Montmartre à Vingt Ans* (Paris, 1938). Immense are the stories of the little Jew's fun and catastrophes. Typically of many is one in which a painter encountered Max on a cold night with his belt pulled into positively the last hole possible. The painter had sold a picture, so away to the luxury restaurants, no grim credit fare to-night! Beautiful room, glorious food, out of season fruit, fine Napoleon brandy—Max beamed wth exhilaration. Dinner ended, the friendly painter called the waiter and demanded the bill *and the police!* The restaurant was so *chic* that the management allowed the artists to depart with dignity. One day, October 7, 1909, Max Jacob had a tremendous experience. He thus describes it: I had come back from the *Bibliothèque nationale;* I put my brief-case away; I was looking for my slippers, and when I looked up there was someone

[2]Guillaume Apollinaire (whose real name was Kostrowiszki) was a Pole. His poems and writings did much to launch the moderns on their career of success.

[3]To gather these few notes on Max Jacob, I have used Mr. Gaunt's book; R. Dorgelès, *Bouquet de Bohème,* Paris, 1947; F. Carco, *Montmartre à Vingt ans,* Paris, 1938; *Les Veillées du 'Lapin Agile'*, edited by F. Carco, with extracts from Apollinaire, M. Jacob, Salmon, *etc.,* Paris, 1919; and above all, A. Billy, *Max Jacob, une étude avec un choix de poèmes, des inédits, des portraits, une bibliographie* (Poètes d'Aujourd' hui), Paris, 1949.

on the wall. I fell to the ground...Oh, imperishable second! Oh truth! truth! The divine Body is on the wall of this miserable room. Why, Lord! Oh! pardon me...He! What beauty, grace and gentleness! His shoulders, His bearing! He wore a yellow silk robe with blue edgings..."

The next day Max hurried to a church, demanding baptism. He burst into the sacristy where a curate, smoking his pipe, laughed Max out of the place. He probably had often seen Max in gay company, and who can blame him? Max Jacob firmly believed in the reality of his vision, which was later repeated in a cinema.[4] Opinion was divided among his friends. Some were indignant that Max Jacob was not allowed to enter the Church; others regarded the whole affair as the latest of Max's escapades. He persisted in his demand for the Sacrament of Baptism, which, after much instruction from the Fathers of Notre-Dame-de-Sion (Max remarked that the Catholic religion seems to have a monopoly of hyphens!), he received on February 18, 1914.[5] With childlike humour, he enjoyed the sensation the event caused in the world of Montmartre. They did him proud. Pablo-Ruiz Picasso was godfather with an actress from the Variety Theatre as god-mother. Picasso wanted his godchild baptized *Fiacre,* but Max preferred Cyprian. A rich friend provided the carriages, and the little Jew was received into the church. Hard was his battle against *Paris et ses attraits.* A confessor advised him to avoid a certain rich man's house. How easy to say, sighed Max, how difficult to do! The lonely streets that Utrillo painted were very lonely on wet, cold nights. The rich man's house, filled with flowers, lovely ladies and music was not far away. And what a welcome he would get—he, the gentle clown—Little Max, dance for us! Max, amuse us, Max! It was 1914; never would the happy times before August, 1914, return to Montmartre. The

---

[4]Max Jacob rarely discussed these visions, or allowed himself to be questioned on the matter. He would affirm his conviction, and then change the subject. Here are a few lines from one of his poems:

Donc, la première fois Tu vins dans ma maison.
Et la seconde fois au Cinématographe...
"Vous allez donc alors au Cinématographe,
Me dit un confesseur, la mine confondue.
Eh! mon Père! Le Seigneur n'y est-il pas venu?"

Whatever may be thought of the truth of these "visions," they had, at length, an extraordinary effect on the life of Max Jacob.

[5]Notre-Dame-de-Sion was founded by the celebrated Jewish convert, Father Marie-Alphonse Ratisbonne, and his brother Theodore. The founder had had, as a Jew, an extraordinary vision of Our Lady in a Roman Church, which was the cause of his sensational conversion. His foundation was destined especially to work for the conversion of the Jews.

Army rejected Max Jacob and Utrillo at first sight. So the years passed of temptations resisted and temptations not so well resisted. In the 1920's Max Jacob deserted Paris—a supreme sacrifice for one who has once drunk of the waters of the Seine. A most admirable, a most courageous parish priest of Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire took this strange convert as a guest for three months, and then procured rooms for him near the church. The housekeeper, a wise and kind woman, was at first alarmed, then amused, and, finally, deeply touched by the piety and zeal of this new parishioner. His great devotion was the Way of the Cross, which daily he made with great beating of his breast and loud groans to the alarm of pious old women, who heard him cry out: Have pity on me, I am the good thief! Early in the morning Max was at the church for his meditation, then mass and communion, his gestures and his adoring gaze at the Sacred Host were likewise subjects of comment. He had received permission from the priests to wear a beret in the Church as the cold affected his bald head. If an altar boy did not appear, this strange figure became animated. He rushed to the sacristy, consulted the *Ordo,* and his striking of the breast at the *Confiteor* was tremendous. He did not kneel during the prayers at the foot of the altar, but stood with great reverence. Panic siezed the Church if Max could not find the sanctuary bell. And when found, he rang it as if it were a fire bell. He spent three hours in the church in the morning, returning for the Stations of the Cross and the evening prayers. He worked away at his poems during the day, printed placards for the church, arranged the Crib at Christmas. His charity was boundless, stinting himself to send help to his poor friends in Montmartre. He was as obedient as a child. While staying at the presbytery, he had set a waste paper basket on fire by throwing a lighted match into it. He was requested to go into the garden when he desired to smoke. He obeyed, but it must have been nerve racking for the priests and housekeeper, as he was dashing in and out of the garden all day long. Death was the subject of many of Max Jacob's meditations. Here is an example of one: "I shall die. I shall die with the hope that God will not despise my efforts to do good. When shall I die? Where? How? Will it be in a hospital? In this room? In the street? Shall I have persevered in the faith? Shall I be in the state of grace? St. Joseph, Holy Virgin, pray that I may be ready! Shall I have time for confession? My God, grant that I may be ready! My body has been prepared. Friends come to see my body; they enter in silence; they leave with laughter. One of them has stolen a book from the room. My relatives are too busy to mourn me, and life will go on..."

Sometimes in the last years successful friends came to visit him. They found a profoundly religious Max, who, while not envious of their success, yet felt a little bitterness that his work which had inspired so much of the modern movement was hardly acknowledged, even by old friends. Poor Max, who had constantly meditated upon the circumstances of death, had never hit upon the manner of his own death, death in a concentration camp. In 1944, as a Jew, he was arrested and interned. He died soon after and was buried in the poorest of the Parisian cemeteries, that of Ivry. In his will he expressed the wish that his body should await the glorious Resurrection at Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire; his wish is to be respected. One—at least one, Max!—of his old comrades of Montmartre went out to Ivry to visit the last resting place of Max Jacob. On a grey autumn morning, with mud thick on the paths, he sought the quiet resting place of the restless Max. Suddenly he saw, with a pang, the grave: Here rests Max Jacob, 1876-1944. The friend took his pencil and wrote under those bald words: Pray for him, because he felt Max would have liked it. The worldly writer who had written those Christian words of prayer suddenly felt that he could no longer think of Max Jacob as poor Max. Respect and admiration for this brilliant, unfortunate man filled his heart, and the grandeur and the beauty of Max Jacob's example struck him with force.[6]

T. VEECH.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

CHANGING THE CONSTITUTION. Proceedings of the All-Australian Federal Convention, Sydney, 25th-26th July, 1949. pp. 197, n.p.

The proceedings here reported are to be explained as a constructive reaction to the trend, marked in recent Australian experience, to modify the Commonwealth Constitution from a federal to a unitary form.

By now publishing this book of proceedings, edited by Professor F. A. Bland —that "incorrigible Federalist" as the reviewer recalls the Professor's self-description—the N.S.W. Constitutional League hopes to stir public interest in the important problems of revising the Constitution.

Why a Federal System, State Financial Independence, Why New States, Constitutional Revision, Constitution Building (an address by Sir Robert Garran, as delightful as it is sound)—these are the titles of Chapters covering realistic review of conditions under the existing Constitution. But, as Professor Bland observes: "It is easier to state the problems than to devise machinery for finding a solution." (p. 9.)

The N.S.W. Constitutional League, therefore, presents this booklet to the people in the hope of stirring them to the exercise of their right and their duty in that regard. N.T.

[6]The golden talk and brilliant imitations of Max Jacob have vanished with their author. He left behind him his famous trunk, packed full of poems, mostly unpublished. Hence as André Billy says it is impossible yet to see him properly as a writer. Indeed his acrobatic playing on words will always make him a difficult author for Frenchmen, and an impossible writer for foreigners.

Book Reviews

THE FIRST CATHOLIC MISSION TO THE AUSTRALIAN ABORIGINES, by Rev. Osmund Thorpe, C.P. With an Introduction by the Most Rev. Paul Marella, Apostolic Delegate. Pellegrini and Co. pp. xii, 271. 25s.

Cardinal Moran's "History of the Catholic Church in Australasia" devoted a whole chapter (XI) to the short-lived mission which Archbishop Polding established and four Passionist priests conducted at Dunwich, on Stradbroke Island, in the eighteen-forties. Father Osmund Thorpe, of the Congregation of the Passion, has written a detailed record of the venture and its background and probed the causes of its failure. Declining to write merely a popular story, a drama with picturesque scenes that shift from Rome to Sydney and Moreton Bay's stone-age natives and then to infant Adelaide and Valparaiso, the author wisely preferred to draw up a well-documented monograph of critical value. The text is complemented with copious notes, at the end of each chapter, and five appendices contain relevant letters and reports.

A notable feature is a closer acquaintance, which access to the Passionist archives has provided, with the four missionaries and in particular with Father Raymund Vaccari and his qualifications to be superior of the mission. A sketch of each of the band is followed by an account of the aborigines and of their relations with the whites. A narrative vividly relates the hopeful beginnings and the dismal end of the undertaking. The most valuable chapter, to which most of the book leads, is that on the causes of the failure. To this is added the subsequent history of the three priests who left Dunwich in 1845, after two years on the island, one of them returning to Italy from Adelaide a few years later and two serving that diocese faithfully until their death. The author throws only a little more light on the unfortunate superior after his departure from Dunwich in 1846, to make his way to Tweed Heads (not to Sydney, as Cardinal Moran said) in an open boat, and thence to Sydney in a schooner, and finally to Lima, where he was identified after thirteen years.

Dr. Polding is not absolved from blame. Unbusinesslike, and optimistic to a fault, "he never detailed a case well", as Ullathorne said of him, and Fr. Thorpe considers it "unlikely" that he revealed the whole position to the Passionists in Rome on his visit in 1842. To a lack of administrative ability he joined an excessive zeal for the Benedictines in

the vast territory under his care. Just as he got St. Mary's Cathedral declared a Benedictine Abbey, he looked forward to turning the Northern mission into a Benedictine establishment. In any case, he imagined, with almost childish simplicity, that it was easy to convert the aborigines.

On the other hand, the good bishop had to contend with a complication that he could not easily have anticipated. This was the appointing of Fr. Vaccari, Prefect Apostolic. Archbishop Polding declared that the appointment was made without his knowledge; but the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda said the contrary. Was this apple of discord simply the fruit of a misunderstood conversation?

Fr. Vaccari receives the strictest censure from the author. He made known his quasi-independent status, as Prefect Apostolic, on reaching Sydney, to the understandable chagrin of the Archbishop; and his self-confidence did not sweeten his relations either with Sydney or with his brethren on the island. Indeed, the Father-General would never have allowed this man to go to Australia—spiritual director of high ecclesiastics though he had been—except that orders had been given from higher up, which "could only mean that the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda made a definite request for his services", concludes Fr. Thorpe. Nevertheless, one must feel sorry for that gifted priest, a friend of Blessed Vincent Pallotti, left alone with the blacks, in fear of his life; then probably shipwrecked on the way to South America; and afterwards working in a friary garden in Peru, until he was recognized and received into the community.

The civil government gets its share of blame for being apathetic towards the mission, and, of course, the extreme difficulty is not overlooked of instructing and baptizing nomads steeped in customs incompatible with Christian morality, and even of providing, in the straitened circumstances, for the care of the children who were baptized.

Incidentally, the author refers to Archbishop Polding's letter from Brisbane to his Vicar-General, in 1843, in which, after giving facts about Dunwich, he wrote: "We arrived on the Feast of the Blessed Virgin, *Auxilium Christianorum,* 24th May. The First Mass celebrated was on the Feast of the Ascension (the next day), the gospel of which is so appropriate". Was that first Mass celebrated at Dunwich, the first port of call then, or at Brisbane, where the letter was written? Fr. Thorpe weighs the data and concludes "the whole question to some extent remains undecided".

The reviewer may be permitted to add that his task has had a

special interest for him, since he has known the site of the mission (of which no traces remain) for forty years, that he can see Stradbroke Island across Moreton Bay as he writes at Banyo Seminary, and that Fr. Snell's registry of the first baptisms on the island (those of the two half-caste Smith children) was once given to him by the late Mgr. T. Hayden, and later, on the centenary of the Church in Queensland, presented by him to Archbishop Duhig, in whose possession the document now is.

C.R.

* * * *

THE MYSTERY OF FAITH. Book II: The Sacrifice of the Church. Translated by Archpriest Joseph Carroll. Sheed and Ward, London, 1950. 25/-.

This long-awaited volume will be a welcome addition to many a bookshelf. It is not so much a book to be read through, as to be pondered over. The magnificent array of Patristic and Scholastic testimonies will open a door through which many of us could hardly otherwise be expected to pass, seeing that the pressure of various duties, and the unavailability of well-stocked libraries of the theological writings of the past, make it difficult or quite impossible for even the most enthusiastic of us to engage in research of the kind that would be required to follow the development of theological thought on the Mystery of Faith through the formative centuries of Catholic teaching. It must be confessed also that the existence of the monumental work of Fr. de la Taille in the original Latin did not supply this want, and we all owe a debt of gratitude to Fr. Carroll for his long and patient work of translation. The Latin of de la Taille is far from limpid, and his arguments are not the easiest in the world to follow as he expresses them. Doubtless many who were prepared to take the word of others for the value of his contribution to the theology of the Mass will now, because of this translation, find that they can themselves evaluate the work done, and draw their own conclusions.

The first volume of the translation has been in the hands of all now for some years; the second is now published; and the publishers assure us that the third is to follow soon. With this second volume the consideration of the Eucharist as a sacrifice is concluded; the third volume will deal with It as a sacrament. This volume contains theses 16 to 35 of the original; and, as the sub-title informs us, deals with the Sacrifice of the Church. Outstanding among the twenty theses here contained

is thesis 21 (pp. 139-171), dealing with the Mass in relation to the Heavenly Sacrifice; while thesis 24 (pp. 197-222) is a masterly presentation of the question regarding the essential thing that makes the Mass a sacrifice.

The translation is, for the most part, extremely readable and clear. Fr. Carroll has exercised commendable judgment in departing from a slavish imitation of Latin syntax, and has translated into English, dividing sentences, where necessary, into more English forms. From time to time he has inserted a short explanation of terms into the text (for instance p. 183, where viator, comprehensor, anagogic are explained; and p. 291, where the idea of suffrage is briefly outlined). This will aid the memory of clerical readers and will be a necessary assistance to the general reader, of whom it is to be hoped there will be many.

It is not to be expected that any translation, however painstaking will win the complete approval of all; and, since it is generally considered to be the duty of a reviewer to point out some of the defects in the work he is considering, the opportunity is here taken to indicate some few of the blemishes in this scholarly work. Perhaps the most important of these is the omission of the passage occuring on p. 396 in the second edition of the original, beginning (in column 2) with the words: "Unde apparet quaestionem esse revera de ministro sufficiente celebrationis eucharisticae" and continuing for another ten lines. This short but important passage should appear on p. 339 of the translation, after the first sentence of the second paragraph on that page.

In these days it seems to be too much to ask of anyone that Greek quotations should have their accents, breathings and subscripts accurate; but at least we might hope that the actual spelling of words would be carefully checked. In this hope, however, we should be not infrequently disappointed. Passing to the Latin words occasionally inserted in parenthesis in the body of the translation, it is difficult to pass over the extraordinary 'torpescar' (p. 300), where the Latin from which the translation is made has 'torpesceret', which is the form also in that place in Migne. Again on p. 404 the translator has inserted the note (Aug. supplicationes. Vulg. operationes), whereas the word used by Augustine is 'precationes', correctly quoted by de la Taille, and in the Vulgate the word 'operationes' does not here occur.

The translator has had the courage to translate freely in order to be clear, but occasionally one comes across a sentence which is very obscure. Such a sentence is the one on p. 314, which reads: "There is

no parity, as we have repeatedly said, between the opus operatum—the work done—by virtue of the sacrament itself and of the sacrifice itself, and so between the effects ex opere operato—through that work—in each case". Is this as clear as the original: "Nullam esse paritatem, ut saepe commonitum est, inter opus operatum sacramenti et opus operatum sacrificii" (p. 379, col. 2)? There are other occasional blemishes, as has been noted; for instance the same man is referred to on successive pages (pp. 202, 203) as Raynaud and Renaud; but on the whole, these are not such as to detract from the extreme usefulness of the work, and should not discourage anyone from reading it.

J.S.K.

* * * *

LOVE IS A LIGHT BURDEN. The Life of Mother Mary Gonzaga Barry, I.B.V.M. By Mother Mary Oliver, I.B.V.M. Burns Oates.

On a pleasant October morning in 1874, Father Michael Kelly, from the nearby House of the Missionaries of the Blessed Sacrament in Enniscorthy, was exchanging a few friendly words with Rev. Mother Gonzaga Barry, who happened to drop into the Loreto convent parlour just as he was finishing breakfast. The topic of conversation, which for weeks had been filling the Sisters with excitement, was the proposed establishment of a Loreto House in Australia. "You would not be thinking of going yourself, I suppose, Mother?" he ventured with a smile. "No; no thought of it" she replied at once. How little did either of them then realise that he was destined to become one day Archbishop of Sydney and she the pioneer of her Institute in Australia!

In her latest work, *Love is a Light Burden,* Mother Mary Oliver has given us an extensive and comprehensive study of this truly valiant woman to whose prudence, discernment and gift of administration Catholic education will ever remain indebted. With rare literary skill and biographical acumen she traces her career from the cradle to the grave, from the winding Slaney and historic Vinegar Hill to Ballarat, Melbourne, Perth and Sydney, and has compressed into a neat volume of roughly two hundred and sixty pages the romance of her remarkable career.

But the work is much more than a mere biography. It is, beyond doubt a valuable contribution to Australian literature and to Irish and Australian history. Like a powerful searchlight it illuminates and clarifies many important developments during the last three decades of the nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth.

Many great and well-beloved figures of a now all but forgotten past come to life again in its pages, for Mother Barry lived on intimate terms and corresponded freely with Archbishops, Bishops, and clergy throughout the whole of Australasia. For Mother Mary of the Cross, whom she resembled in many respects, she had unbounded admiration, always regarding her as a living saint.

The general attractiveness of the book is greatly enhanced by the addition of a delightful foreword written, fittingly enough, by Father T. A. Walsh, S.J., whose mother and sister accompanied Mother Barry on her first voyage to Australia, and remained her life-long friends.

R.W.

* * * *

MOMENTS OF LIGHT: Notes on the Spiritual Life, by Dom Hubert Van Zeller, O.S.B. (Burns Oates, London; 184 pp.; 7/6.)

Dom Van Zeller is well known for his original, entertaining, and suggestive books on the Prophets of the Old Testament. Here he turns to studies on the life of prayer—a subject dear to the modern Benedictines. "Moments of Light" consists of 170 loosely connected lecturettes, every one of which I have read with interest and—I hope—with profit, even though I found a certain number of the little instructions irritating and 'foggy'. In the blurb it is stated that the book aims at explaining "to the neophytes and encouraging the advanced". It will certainly accord interest and encouragement to the more advanced, but in my opinion a certain number of the lecturettes cannot be recommended to the neophyte. It may confuse and discourage him. Just as it is unwise for a man who is inclined to worry about his health to be given a lot of warnings about vitamins, the nursing of the glands, the all-potency of grated carrots and raw lettuce and raw cabbage and the awful danger —mostly imaginary—of auto-intoxication, so it is possible to produce a spiritual food-faddist and even a spiritual hypochondriac by an overdose of 'dark nights' of the senses or of the soul. Undoubtedly all souls aiming at perfection, must experience at times—perhaps even for lengthy periods—a purifying loneliness and depression—the 'exile of the heart' as a Kempis calls it—with a hunger and thirst for the Absent One; but instructions on this state of bereavement should be dealt with in soothing, encouraging, and—above all—in plain matter of fact language entirely free from anything savouring of exaggeration or morbidity. Many of the mystical writers seem incapable of clear, matter of fact exposition, and their writings are not suitable for the *neophytes*.

After a good many thoughts on 'dark nights' of the soul and senses—not always encouraging—the author soothes us with a nice little talk on "Fear" (p. 103), ending thus: "Go out into the darkness and put your hand into the hand of God. That shall be better to you than light. Nothing to be afraid of. Nothing whatever". We can do with more of that.

"Zeal for Souls" (pp. 52, 53) seems slightly muddled and obscure. Pp. 170, 171, 172 seem unreal and unpractical and include a deplorable quotation from Ruysbroeck on dying "in the fury of love". It is a pity that the literary style of some—indeed many—of the mystics should be positively loathsome.

On pp. 65, 66, is a bold and slightly alarming idea—and, I think, true—on human and divine love. If you have been once really in love with a human being, you never quite lose it. "It enters into the blood stream". The author then turns to divine love. "The human and divine love are analogous at almost every point, but they seem to divide in the matter of finality. Where the human lover is, in the course of nature, chained to his initial surrender, the soul that has loved God can be false to its dedication and call the whole thing off". A terrible thought, which the author elaborates and, as I said, I think it is true.

As the number of lecturettes in this book is 170, it would be impossible to give an adequate selection of so many subjects, handled with vivacity and instruction—though, I think, not suitable in many parts for *beginners* in the ways of prayer. For others, excellent.

E.B.

COMMUNICATION FROM APOSTOLIC DELEGATION.

The following document was received when the *Record* was being printed:

The Apostolic Delegation is pleased to forward herewith a copy of the Rescript from the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide (N. 4382/50) which concerns the faculty regarding the Eucharistic Fast granted to the Ordinaries of Australia and New Zealand by the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments on 12th January, 1948 (N. 9569/47) for a period of three years, and forwarded to the Ordinaries by this Delegation in April, 1948.

It will be noticed that there is no mention of a limitation to three times a week in the new Rescript; that the conditions re breaking the fast are made much more precise, and that the Rescript is given for five years.

Prot. N. 4382/50.

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE PROPAGANDA FIDE

Beatissime Pater

Ordinarii ditionum Novae Zelandiae et Australiae, ad pedes Sanctitatis Vestrae provoluti, humiliter facultatem petunt dispensandi a lege jejunii eucharistici infirmos in nosocomiis degentes, fideles sexagenarios adversa valetudine laborantes, mulieres praegnantes et lactantes et personas ex officio et gravi cum incommodo in servando jejunio pernoctantes in assistentia infirmorum.

Et Deus....

Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, vigore facultatum sibi a SS.mo Domino Nostro Pio Div. Prov. Papa XII tributarum, benigne adnuit pro gratia iuxta preces, ita ut omnes fideles, de quibus supra, Sanctam Communionem accipere possint post abstinentiam horarum quatuor a cibis solidis, horae unius a potionibus et medicinis (alcoholicis tamen potionibus inde a media nocte exclusis) et infirmis in nosocomiis degentibus necessariam medicinam sumere liceat etiam ultima hora ante ipsam Sanctam Communionem, remota quacumque scandali et admirationis occasione et servatis ceteris animae et corporis dispositionibus.

Praesentibus valituris ad quinquennium.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus eiusdem S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, die 10 mensis novembris a.D. 1950.

(Sgd.) Celsus Costantini,
A Secretis.

EFG ENGLISH AND FOREIGN BOOKSHOP,
28 MARTIN PLACE, SYDNEY. PHONE BW 9807
and AMP LANE off EDWARD STREET, BRISBANE

Les Tresors de Delphes 40/9
Paul Verlaine: Confessions of a Poet 12/3
Memoirs of General de Coulaincourt. 3 Volumes: The Russian Campaign. The Retreat from Moscow. The Abdiction, each 9/6
George Thomson: Aeschylus and Athens 16/6
Robert Brady: Crisis in Britain. Plans and Achievements of the Labor Government 66/-
Gilbert Murray: Stoic, Christian and Humanist 19/9
Egon Wellesz: Essays on Opera 14/9
Hugh Seton-Watson: The East European Revolution 35/-
C. E. Vulliamy: The Anatomy of Satire 17/6
Sara Campion: National Baby (National Health Service) 10/6
Karl Jaspers: The Perenial Scope of Philosophy 16/6
Norman Ault (ed.): Seventeenth Century Lyrics 39/-
Anton C. Pegis: The Wisdom of Catholicism 21/-
W. H. Bruford: Theatre, Drama and Audience in Goethe's Germany 32/9

DICTIONARIES AND GRAMMARS IN ALL LANGUAGES SUITABLE FOR MIGRANTS.

CATHOLIC ART AND CULTURE

Statuary,
Church Plate,
Metalware,
Vestments.

Literature and Pious objects.
There's quality and economy, too, at:

Pellegrini & Co.
PTY. LTD.
Head Office: 543 GEORGE ST., SYDNEY. M 4171.
AND IN ALL AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL CITIES.